The electronic version of the book
is created by
http://www.enverhoxha.ru
****

Enver Hoxha

Reflections on China

ENVER HOXHA

FIRST SECRETARY OF THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE
OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

«Reflections on China» consists of excerpts from the Political Diary of Comrade Enver Hoxha. The notes included in this volume belong to the period 1962-1972. This volume and a second one, which extends to December 1977, were first published and distributed within the Party in January 1978. Now these two volumes are made available to the public in Albanian and foreign languages.

In these notes the zigzags of the Chinese leadership, its revisionist, anti-socialist and anti-Albanian course, are revealed.

From these notes and others which may be published later, the reader will be able to see the analysis the PLA has made and the principled stands it has taken in defence of Marxism-Leninism.

ENVER HOXHA

REFLECTIONS ON CHINA

I

1962 — 1972

EXTRACTS FROM
THE POLITICAL DIARY

TIRANA, 1979

THE INSTITUTE OF MARXIST-LENINIST STUDIES AT THE CENTRAL COMMITTEE OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

Original title
SHËNIME PËR KINËN

THE «8 NËNTORI» PUBLISHING HOUSE

FOREWORD

In the first two volumes of «Reflections on China» opinions have been expressed on and assessments made of the various stands and actions of the Chinese leadership from the beginning of 1962 to December 1977, proceeding from the fundamental principles of Marxism-Leninism which the Party of Labour of Albania consistently applies.

These opinions and assessments are based on facts and events of which we have been informed by the Chinese and foreign press, by the Albanian Embassy in Peking and on rare occasions, officially, by the Chinese leaders themselves.

Since the Chinese leaders have not informed us even of the most important problems of the situation in China and the activity of their party, the facts at our disposal have been incomplete and inadequate, and we have had to make suppositions from which to draw conclusions and express our opinions on the Chinese policy as well as on the consequences of this policy, which has always been characterized by vacillations and opportunism.

Our assessments of the various stands and actions of the Chinese leaders, written in the form of a diary, have been made day to day, at the time they occurred or when we learned of them. The reader should keep this fact in mind in order to properly understand the process by which the Chinese line became known to us, as well as the dialectic of the Marxist-Leninist stands of the Party of Labour of Albania.

Loyal to the principles of proletarian internationalism,

the Party of Labour of Albania has defended the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China both when the Khrushchevite, Titoite and other modern revisionists attacked them, and during the Cultural Revolution, when the Chinese ultra-revisionists, headed by Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, posed a serious threat to the CP of China and Mao Tsetung. At the same time, our Party has followed with concern the anti-Marxist stands and actions taken by the Chinese leaders on many occasions, and to the extent that was realistically possible, has expressed critical opinions about what was going on in China. It has also expressed these opinions at the proper time to the Chinese leadership in the hope that it would put itself on the right course. This hope is reflected in the notes included in these two volumes. Unfortunately, however, revisionism in China grew steadily stronger day by day.

At its 7th Congress and at the 2nd and 3rd Plenums of the CC, the Party of Labour of Albania made a thorough analysis of the anti-Marxist stand and counterrevolutionary actions of the Chinese revisionist leadership, without excluding Mao's responsibility for the situation created. These notes may assist the communists, cadres and other readers to supplement their knowledge of the course of development of Chinese revisionism and the struggle of the PLA against it.

The Author

May 1979

1962

TUESDAY
APRIL 3, 1962

THE REVOLUTIONARY COMMUNISTS EXPECT CHINA TO COME OUT OPENLY AGAINST KHRUSHCHEVITE REVISIONISM

The revolutionary communists in all the communist and workers' parties of the world **expect the Communist Party of China to take an open and direct stand condemning Khrushchevite revisionism which is spreading and causing damage and which has encountered only one open opponent: the Party of Labour of Albania.** They are all in solidarity with, and support the correct line of our Party, admire its courage, but quite correctly expect the Communist Party of China to come out openly. The tactic of the ideological struggle which China is following against the Khrushchevites does not encourage the revolutionary elements, while it gives the waverers the pretext to say: **«See, China is not moving openly for the sake of unity, we should not move either, for otherwise we would split, and that is not good».** And this at a time when the revisionists, on their part, are acting openly and covertly, attacking, slandering, etc. **This is an important problem, but up to now, the Chinese have not had any contact at all with us to discuss these things. Were our enemies to know that between us there is no consultation at all about the fight against the modern revisionists, they would be astonished. They would never believe it. But that is how things stand.**

THURSDAY
APRIL 5, 1962

TIME IS WORKING FOR US, BUT TIME GOES VERY SLOWLY FOR THE CHINESE

The tactic followed by the Communist Party of China against Khrushchevite revisionism, in my opinion, is not completely correct. It seems to me that, regardless of any consideration (as for instance, China's economic and military potential inferior to that of the Soviet Union, its temporary economic difficulties, the difficult situation created by American imperialism, the eventual accusations that may be made and in fact are being made about «Chinese great-state chauvinism», or about the Chinese being «the splitters of the communist movement», etc.), **the Communist Party of China must maintain an open militant stand in defence of Marxism-Leninism. When you see that the disease is grave, that the enemies are not only incorrigible but also actively organizing, slandering, attacking and fighting, it is neither revolutionary nor right to keep silent for the alleged purpose of preserving the rotten unity of the communist movement, or the socialist camp.** Khrushchev cannot mend his ways any more than Tito; where Tito went, Khrushchev will go, or has already gone. You call Tito traitor, and for «tactical» reasons you call Khrushchev «comrade». Time is working for us, but we must help it flow in a revolutionary way. It seems to me that, for the Chinese time goes very slowly.

FRIDAY
APRIL 6, 1962

THE CHINESE ARE GIVING KHRUSHCHEV A HAND

The Chinese ambassador came to transmit to me a message from the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania which, in substance, says: The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China is of the opinion that a meeting should be held with the Soviets on the basis of the proposals of the parties of Indonesia, Vietnam and New Zealand, in order to iron out differences and strengthen the unity of the socialist camp. We must take the initiative, say the Chinese comrades, and uphold the banner of unity. They add that the conditions we have laid down for this meeting are understandable to the Chinese, but will not be accepted by the other parties, therefore, for its part, the Communist Party of China lays down no preconditions. It proposes that we exchange party delegations to discuss the issue.

We shall reply to them. We accept the exchange of delegations with the Communist Party of China, but we will not alter our stand in the least in regard to the proposed meeting with the Soviet revisionists.

This is a wrong course the Chinese comrades are trying to lead us on to, it is an opportunist road of vacillations and concessions to the Khrushchev traitor group which finds itself in grave difficulties, and is intriguing in order to escape defeat. The Chinese comrades are giving it a hand to pull it out of the mire, giving it the possibility to strengthen its positions and go on the attack again.

TUESDAY
APRIL 10, 1962

WHY ALL THESE WAVERINGS TOWARDS THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS?

Apparently, the talk I had on April 6 with the ambassador Lo Shi-gao has obliged the Chinese comrades to hand our ambassador copies of the letters exchanged between the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China. The content of these letters is new to us, because the Chinese comrades said not a word about this correspondence in the message they handed us. My talk caused the revelation of this correspondence which, it seems, the Chinese comrades did not intend to disclose to us.

This is the beginning of an incorrect stand towards us, since we are referred to in these letters. It would have been considered correct for the Communist Party of China, before replying to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, to have informed us about the content of the letter it would send to that party, and possibly to have sought our opinion, too (since we were referred to). Then, whether or not our opinion was taken into consideration, is another question.

As it turns out, without our knowlege, the Chinese comrades long ago commenced negotiations with the Soviet revisionists about meetings and conferences with them, and gave their definite approval. Now the talks they want to hold with us are intended to convince us that we

agree to withdraw the conditions we have laid down and meet the Khrushchevites. If we do not withdraw our preconditions, then the Chinese comrades will escape all responsibility, will have the «argument» to exonerate themselves before Nikita, telling him that the accusation of inciting the Albanians, levelled against them, «is untrue», and that, on the contrary, they «had interceded with the Albanians, advised them, but they did not listen». After this victory, Khrushchev will make the proposal: «We should meet without the Albanians and settle our affairs». If the Chinese comrades accept this, too, then they will take even more difficult roads, will fall into the trap laid by Nikita Khrushchev, who wants at all costs to isolate the Party of Labour of Albania.

The copies of the letters that we shall receive will make the stand of the Chinese comrades completely clear to us. But even now, on the facts we have, one thing is clear to us: very likely they may have fallen into the trap laid for them, as they have kept the correspondence between the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China hidden from us. And here they have made a grave mistake. This is clear to us even without knowing the content of the Chinese reply. As for the Soviet letter, we can imagine what it contains.

THURSDAY
APRIL 12, 1962

THE CHINESE COMRADES CRITICIZE THE SOVIET REVISIONISTS

We received the summary of the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in reply to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The matter does not seem to be completely as we envisaged it. We turned out to be wrong in our judgement of the eventual reply of the Chinese comrades. It is obvious that the Chinese comrades are reflecting and have maintained a correct stand, both on our question and on their question, as well as on other general problems. In their letter, they put the blame on the Soviets, make them responsible, and demand that the Soviets take the initiative for the improvement of their relations with us.

What is important is that the Chinese comrades tell the Soviets that their attempt to isolate Albania from China and the international communist movement is in vain and unacceptable. The stand of the Chinese comrades towards our opponents is good. **Nevertheless, in the message they sent us, the tendency to seek a certain softening on our part is evident.**

Be this as it may, seen from the angle of the Chinese tactic, the reply to the Soviets is good, correct. We must not pass premature judgement on the stands of the Chinese comrades without first being acquainted with their official documents.

FRIDAY
APRIL 13, 1962

A DISGUISED SOVIET ATTACK AGAINST CHINA OVER ALBANIA

«Izvestia» came out today with an article on the unity of the socialist camp. We are attacked in it as «splitters», «anti-Leninists», «dogmatists», etc. These are the usual slanders, but the new thing which clearly emerges is that this article is not aimed at us, but at the Chinese. This article is a public reply to the letter of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China of April 7, which was addressed to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in connection with eventual «talks», etc. This article is a fierce attack, although still disguised, on the correct stand of China which rightly defends us.

This is the beginning. «Izvestia» is telling China: You must leave Albania in the lurch, otherwise you, China, are against unity. Now the Chinese will not entertain illusions, but will become even stronger.

SATURDAY
APRIL 14, 1962

WOE BETIDE THOSE WHO FALL INTO THE REVISIONISTS' TRAP!

Yesterday's article in «Izvestia» was written more against China than against us. We are the pretext, but this article on «unity» is nothing other than the official reply to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China in regard to negotiations over talks. With this article the Soviet revisionists are pursuing several objectives:

1) **To accuse us as «splitters», «dogmatists», etc.** But these banal repetitions do nothing but expose the real authors, of the split, the Soviets themselves.

2) **To reject the platform of the Chinese for talks, telling them: We, the Soviets, will not come to the talks on your platform. We do not, nor will we recognize that we are guilty of any fault towards the Albanians; on the contrary, we are on the Marxist-Leninist road**, while the Albanians and you are on the anti-Leninist road; we shall take no step towards the improvement of our relations with the Albanians. **The Albanians must be abandoned so that they do not become an obstacle to your (the Chinese) submission to us (the Soviets). Your (the Chinese) road is the road of division.** There is only one road: this is our road. Take it or leave it! If you do not accept it, then the struggle will begin, even openly.

3) **To play their last card in order to intimidate China**

or make it waver from its correct positions. But we can describe these threats as the farts of an ass, which only make the air stink but frighten nobody — they merely show the fear Khrushchev and his men have in their bellies.

4) **To hint to the Americans and the Belgrade group that no agreement can be reached with Albania and China, therefore they should not worry. But in return (the Soviets) tell them: Make us some concession, because we have been exposed, and this is not good either for you or for us, or for our common plan: the destruction of socialism.**

5) **To give a clear-cut directive for Khrushchev's satellites, wherever they are, whether in power or not.**

For them, this article has two aims: a) To consolidate the positions of the betrayers of Leninism around Khrushchev. To the satellites, who have been informed of the content of the letters of the Communist Party of China, the article says: This will be our stand towards the Communist Party of China. So you, too, must publish in your press what «Izvestia» has published, publicize this article, compromise yourselves! b) **To threaten the satellites if they move. Khrushchev tells them: I'll do to you what I did to the Albanians and the Chinese, and then you will be placed under fire from three directions (my fire, the Chinese-Albanian fire and the interna! fire).** I'll stop your rations, so don't do anything silly.

This is the diabolical work of the revisionists. Woe betide those who get caught up in it!

6) **To tell the parties that take a principled stand: Turn back, do not link yourselves with China, or you'll have cause to regret it!**

7) **To cover up the defeat they have suffered in the international and internal arena, to divert the attention of the public from the crimes they have committed against the good cadres within the country, etc. But**

the public asks: Can this little socialist Albania, that is being attacked in this manner by Khrushchev, really be so dangerous?

It is becoming clear to public opinion day by day that it is «dangerous» not because of its military potential, but because of its ideological potential.

SUNDAY
APRIL 22, 1962

TO CEASE THE IDEO-POLITICAL STRUGGLE MEANS TO ALLOW THE ENEMY TO HARM YOU

The campaign initiated by the Khrushchevites for the cessation of the «polemics in the press and radio» is spreading. It must be clearly understood who was the first to start the public polemics. It was the group around Khrushchev. **Two lines, two stands on theoretical and international questions emerged: one opportunist, revisionist line which deviated from Marxism-Leninism, violated the Moscow Statement, supported Titoism and sought to extinguish the struggle against it, opened the way to concessions to imperialism, toned down the struggle against it, flattered it, etc. This was the line of the Khrushchevites. Ours was the other line, which remained faithful to Marxism-Leninism and the Statements of the Moscow Meetings.**

Short though it was time proved the correctness of our line. The revisionists failed in every attempt. They exposed themselves badly, scored no success, were shaken. They are seeking a way out of their difficulties, want a breathing-space to prepare weapons and recommence the offensive on the same terrain, with the same arguments. They also need time to come to agreement with the imperialists. That is why they are seeking unity. But what sort of unity are they talking about? The unity which existed

before, and they themselves destroyed, or a unity which is a sort of *modus vivendi?* They are for the latter.

The Soviet revisionists, like the Yugoslav and the other revisionists, do not alter their course. Every attempt they make under the pretext of «unity» is a fraud. According to them, unity means: Submit to our views, «the only Leninist» views! The aim of their blandishments in this direction is to compromise you, to force you into submission, then to attack you even more fiercely than they have done and are still doing.

For Khrushchev, to cease the ideological and political struggle means: Leave me in peace to continue on the course I have set out on which I shall not change.

This manoeuvre is clear to the Party of Labour of Albania. It seems to be clear, also, to the Communist Party of China, but it does not seem to be as clear as it should be to the Vietnam Workers' Party, the Korean Workers' Party, the Communist Party of Indonesia, the Communist Party of New Zealand, etc. The sentimental desire for «unity for unity's sake» prevails in these parties. Officially, the Communist Party of China seems to be in agreement with the thesis of «unity». In principle we, too, are for unity, but always unity on the Marxist road. The Communist Party of China seems to have great hopes in the success of this thesis. Whereas we have no hope at all, as long as we do not see concretely that the Khrushchevites publicly recognize their mistakes. They are not doing this and will not do so. For the time being we shall keep quiet. This is to Khrushchev's advantage, but we shall deliberately employ this tactic temporarily, in order, you might say, to «please» the Chinese and other comrades who will soon be more thoroughly convinced that this plan of Khrushchev's, too, was a hoax. This tactic will not last long, this Khrushchevite manoeuvre will be exposed by Khrushchev himself and we shall help him expose it.

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 13, 1962

CHINA IS PROCEEDING ON A CENTRIST COURSE

After a long Odyssey, after crossing many seas, Comrades Hysni [Kapo] and Ramiz [Alia] reached China these days. They have begun talks with the Chinese comrades and have sent us several radiograms in which they keep us informed about the views of the comrades in Peking on the problems that are worrying us.

First, the Chinese comrades expressed solidarity with our views in connection with international questions and the revisionist group of Khrushchev and his followers. They described our stands as correct and **said that we (Albanians) had our hands free to fight the Khrushchevites, because they attacked us first.** They declared that they would not go to the meeting without us, that they would not go to any surprise meeting which Khrushchev might prepare, in his usual way. **They also told us that they had received a reply from the Communist Party of the Soviet Union in a letter of 50 pages, of which 40 were against us.** After they received this letter, the Chinese comrades published parts from my speech in the electoral campaign, of course, with some delay.

Now all the efforts of the Chinese comrades are centered on the question of convincing us of lifting the preconditions we have laid down for a meeting and take part in the one which, of course, the Soviets and the Chinese are to prepare. The reasons they give for their insistence

are baseless, weak, and with a pronounced opportunist spirit. The Chinese comrades seem hesitant about and afraid of the struggle against the revisionists, overestimate the strength of the enemy and underestimate our strength and that of international communism. They are trying to reach some sort of compromise. Our firm stand is hindering them, so they are beating about the bush.

The Soviets are afraid of us and can never agree to a meeting with our participation. They are working hard to expel us from the international communist movement; they are working in this direction against China, too, but by means of demagogy, blackmail, intimidation, etc. **In this situation, China is taking a centrist course, hesitating.**

We are not budging a hair's breadth from our correct positions of principle. The comrades have been and are clear about this; I have sent the comrades some telegrams about the situation. Let us see what the Chinese will do. If they do not change their stand on this important tactical issue, then we shall not reach agreement on anything. They ought to reflect.

SUNDAY
JUNE 24, 1962

TIME WILL TELL WHETHER WE ARE RIGHT

The Chinese have declared a state of war in Fukien province and announced in a communique that the Chiang Kai-shek forces, assisted by the Americans, would attack China about July. They also communicated this to our ambassador at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China. They have taken measures to cope with this attack. The communique is not alarming. The Chinese may have, and they certainly have facts about this, and it is natural that they should make the matter public and warn the population.

The Americans are capable of embarking on this venture in order to create a tense situation in the Taiwan Straits. If they land and establish themselves, then they gain a foothold from which to create further complications. If they fail, and they will certainly fail, the Americans lose nothing, because this is what they are feeding Chiang Kai-shek and his men for.

However, in the existing situation and facing a complete and resounding failure of this venture, our opinion is that the Americans will not involve themselves in it. On the one hand, I think that with this the Americans want to test the determination of China and find out the extent of the differences between China and the Soviet Union. On the other hand, we must suppose that all this may be only an imperialist-revisionist manoeuvre to boost the fallen prestige of Khrushchev, who will seize this oppor-

tunity to proclaim that he «will defend China» and other such boastful nonsense, in his usual style, and to force it (China) to publish Nikita's bluffs in its press. That is, to compel China to call the pig her uncle and, willy-nilly, to tone down the differences and go crest-fallen to meetings and conferences with the Soviets. Looking at the question from this angle, I think China made a tactical blunder when it made a public statement about this so-called attack. It should have continued its preparations and liquidated the Chiang Kai-shek forces if they landed on the mainland. Time will tell whether we are right.

MONDAY
JULY 2, 1962

THE CHINESE ARE MOVING TOWARDS CONCILIATION WITH THE KHRUSHCHEVITES

Speaking on television about his trip to Rumania, the revisionist Khrushchev raised the Chinese question and declared: «If China is attacked, then the Soviet Union will defend China», etc. He would have been stupid not to exploit this opportunity to use his despicable demagogy at a time when the Soviet divisions are moving towards China on the Sinkiang border, and the Soviet consulate there is preparing and organizing people against the state power in China and has caused nearly 60,000 Chinese to flee to the Soviet Union. **Now the Chinese, willy-nilly, will publicize this declaration through the press, but it seems as if they are eager for such a pretext. They are moving towards conciliation, as if this is what they want.** Perhaps we are doing them an injustice, but this is a victory, a temporary one, but nevertheless a victory for the revisionist Khrushchev. This harms us. For the time being, we are obliged to keep quiet about him, and the enemy will take advantage of this in order to act. **But we are unmoved, everything will be explained in our favour**, in favour of Marxism-Leninism.

TUESDAY
JULY 3, 1962

WE SHALL PRESS ON. WE SHALL NEVER SURRENDER

The process of the unification of modern revisionism and the Tito-Khrushchev complete accord are developing at a headlong gallop. Nothing is holding it back. The international communist movement is silent, utterly silent.

Innumerable delegations are being exchanged between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union. The Yugoslavs and the Soviets declare publicly that their ideological differences are quite insignificant and are being eliminated. With loud publicity, the Soviet Union is preparing to accord Yugoslavia credits. Brezhnev is to go to Yugoslavia, etc. Everything we have foreseen and predicted is being confirmed to the letter. **Revisionism is on the up and up, we are in the minority, but we shall press on, we shall never surrender. Right is on our side, Marxism-Leninism is on our side, and we shall triumph, certainly we shall triumph. Ours is a difficult, unequal fight, but just and glorious.**

WEDNESDAY
JULY 4, 1962

THIS SMELLS OF ECONOMIC PRESSURE. WE MUST GUARD AGAINST PROVOCATIONS!

Comrades Hysni and Ramiz have ended their work in China and are in Burma. They arrive in Rome on the 6th. On the majority of questions they were in agreement with the Chinese comrades, **except over participation in the eventual meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the world.** We maintained our position, the Chinese theirs.

At the meeting he had with our comrades, Chou En-lai told them that it would be difficult for China to supply us with all the things on which agreements have been signed. Our comrades opposed this because it smelled of economic pressure. This is serious. However, we must await our comrades' return to judge it better. Mao gave them a very fine welcome, had good words for them, he knew nothing about what Chou had said, and promised that he would talk with his comrades.

We must be very cautious. We must be cool-headed and prudent, because the enemy is working intensively to divide us from China, trying to isolate us. **We must guard against provocations, must measure our steps well, must not make any concession over principles, and safeguard our friendship and links with China, because this has great importance for us and for international communism.**

THURSDAY
JULY 5, 1962

THE CHINESE COMRADES ARE NOT DRAWING THE PROPER CONCLUSIONS FROM EVENTS IN THE WORLD

Khrushchev's declaration about China will be used by the modern revisionists «to build up» the credit of their leader, by presenting this traitor as a «Marxist» who makes no concessions to the imperialists, and who, regardless of the contradictions which he has with China, when the need arises, «will hurl himself into the flames» on its behalf. Of course, this is all a bluff which will be short-lived, but for a time it will fool many people.

In order to diminish the bad effect which this declaration of his might have had among the Americans, Khrushchev the lackey yesterday attended a celebration at the American Embassy in Moscow, even at a time when the ambassador was absent. The President of the United States of America has never attended a celebration at the Soviet Embassy in Washington. This dirty scoundrel, Khrushchev, goes there every year.

The declaration which he made will serve him as a trump card at the Peace Congress. And he will also use it against us if we attack him openly, accusing us of allegedly joining the imperialist chorus against him, when he is defending our friend, China. But we are not falling into this provocative trap.

With this declaration, Khrushchev will try to soften

up China, to lead it into a trap, to smooth over the contradictions in his favour. We shall see what China will do, will it see this trap, which, to a certain degree, it has set for itself? China failed to take into account «the movement of missiles» in aid of Cuba. When Cuba was attacked at the Giron Beach «Khrushchevs' missiles» did not move, but later Escalante (**1**), «the Khrushchevite missile», moved. Interesting, the Chinese comrades are not drawing the proper conclusions from events in the world. The Chinese denunciation of an eventual American-Chiang Kai-shek attack on China seems to say: «Khrushchev, we are holding out a hand, grab it. Both you and I have a sound reason, I, the Chinese, to move towards conciliation, and you, Khrushchev, towards rehabilitation, at least temporarily».

We will see how the situation develops further, how the Chinese proceed.

Today Hysni and Ramiz should leave Rangoon for Rome by plane. They will make many things clear to us.

1 A. Escalante, former organizational secretary of the Committee of United Revolutionary Organizations of Cuba.

TUESDAY
JULY 10, 1962

PRONOUNCED TENDENCIES TO SOFTENING, FEAR, AND PASSIVITY ARE APPEARING IN THE CHINESE LINE

Comrade Hysni reported to us on the talks which were held in Peking. The Chinese comrades welcomed our comrades very warmly and had many good words to say about our Party and our people.

The main thing which comes out of the talks is that on the questions of principled importance concerning political and ideological problems, the Chinese leadership has views identical with our Party. The views expressed about and assessments made of modern revisionism, the Titoite group, the Khrushchev group, and the zealous followers of these groups, were also identical with ours. The great danger of these revisionist groups and of modern revisionism, in general, is assessed in the same way. The necessity of the struggle against them was stressed with force both by our comrades and from the Chinese side. This has great importance. However, on the tactics of the struggle against revisionists, as they expressed themselves, there are some differences. **In the Chinese line there are pronounced tendencies to softening, fear, and passivity.**

Briefly, the Chinese comrades explain this on the grounds that the Khrushchev group is strong economically and militarily, and is relying on the prestige of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

This group is in power. The same situation exists in the other communist and workers' parties. Work must be done in such a way as to create revolutionary nuclei in these parties, and bring about a break, though in many of them the division has taken place. **Therefore, according to the Chinese, allegedly we should accept even a formal unity and uphold this banner, and create an anti-imperialist front even with the revisionists.**

On the question of the meeting, the Chinese comrades vacillated, but leaned towards attending. They tried to convince us that we, too, should go to the meeting in order to struggle, etc., etc.

In a word, there are differences in our tactics, but we shall not shift from the positions we have taken, which in our circumstances and the international circumstances are correct and revolutionary. The Chinese comrades recognized this, and made no criticism of our stand.

Hence, time will prove who is right, but it is important that we are in agreement on the main questions. The enemies are trying to isolate us from China. We must avoid this trap, must proceed prudently and cautiously with the Communist Party of China, must strengthen our links and collaboration with it, because the Communist Party of China stands in a correct principled position and is cur friend that supports and helps us.

The importance of the Communist Party of China for international communism is colossal. We must take account of these especially important considerations in our work and we shall do so, without violating any principles or making concessions. I believe that the Chinese comrades will reflect ,more deeply on our stand. And we, too, must carefully study the facts about and assessments of the Communist Party of China.

It is too soon to consider this question settled. We shall return to these capital problems many times.

WEDNESDAY
DECEMBER 5, 1962

PAJETTA (1) LAUNCHED A HARSH ATTACK ON THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA

The speech of the Chinese delegate at the Congress of the Italian Communist Party was a good hard-hitting one. He put forward the correct Marxist-Leninist line of the Communist Party of China on theoretical and political questions, as well as on the problem of Cuba; defended us, raised the problem of the Sino-Indian border, sternly denounced Titoite Yugoslavia, as well; replied to Togliatti's speech, which he condemned, and showed that the Communist Party of China was not in agreement with the leadership of the Communist Party of Italy over many things. However, in his speech the Chinese delegate sought the holding of talks between their two parties. This is the affair of the Chinese! These talks will not yield even the smallest fruit. It is work in vain.

Pajetta, this individual sold out to the Italian bourgeoisie, launched an open filthy attack in a provocative way on the Communist Party of China in particular. Now everything is clear to the Chinese comrades. They can see more clearly with whom they have to do, see the correctness of our Party's judgement about these people.

---

1 Giancarlo Pajetta, member of the leadership of the Italian (revisionist) CP.

TUESDAY
DECEMBER 11, 1962

THE FIGHT AGAINST TRAITORS MUST BE WAGED OPENLY, STERNLY, AND WITHOUT COMPROMISE OVER PRINCIPLES

It is clear to us that Khrushchev and his minions, who have just held the congresses of their parties, have organized a new attack on the Party of Labour of Albania and especially on the Communist Party of China. The attack on the latter was open and launched with hooligan methods. These congresses were intended to raise the prestige of the Khrushchev group, which is at rock-bottom, and at the same time, to slander our parties in order to discredit our correct stands which expose their treacherous activities. These attacks also have the objective of intimidating the Communist Party of China over a split, which in fact they have consummated, of isolating it from the Party of Labour of Albania, that is, through trickery, blackmail and intimidation, of trying to lead the Communist Party of China up their blind alley. They are doing all these things in order to get a hold on China and then to put the boot in after they have thrown it to the ground.

The Communist Party of China will not fall into their trap, because it knows with whom it is dealing. In principle the talks which the Communist Party of China proposed to hold with the Italian Communist Party, and the suggestions that it made at the congress of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia for a general meeting appear not

to be wrong in principle, but bearing in mind with whom we are dealing, **these talks are not only sterile, but are also harmful, because they (the revisionists) are completely on the course of open treachery, organizers of secret and open plots against Marxism-Leninism.** These people are not altering their course, but want to gain time to develop their treachery further. To this end they are trying to draw whomever they can and as many as they can on to their course. **Therefore, our Party will agree to nothing and will not be deceived by traitors allegedly for the purpose of observing the forms which have also been violated by the traitors. The struggle against them must be waged openly, sternly and without compromise over principles.**

THURSDAY
DECEMBER 20, 1962

CHINA IS NOT ACTING WELL IN FAILING TO REPLY TO KHRUSHCHEV'S ATTACKS

With Tito's visit to Moscow, any struggle against the Titoite clique, even just for the sake of appearances, came to an end. We can say that he scored a great success. He trampled on Nikita Khrushchev and especially his revisionist friends all over Europe. Tito made them all eat their own words, and sing hymns in his praise. Now all the revisionists are rushing to make up for the lost time.

The American agency now has its hands free because the Khrushchevites have opened all doors to it. The Titoites have become omnipotent and will know how to work and to activize themselves for the degeneration of all those parties and countries which opened the doors to them. Khrushchev and Tito are pleased with their talks. Of course, the latter had a series of concrete proposals in his pocket from Kennedy, the head of American imperialism, which he put before Khrushchev, and no doubt, the two arrived at satisfactory conclusions. Tito will present these to Kennedy for final approval. Undoubtedly, we shall soon see the concrete results of these talks in new retreats and scandalous compromises.

Up till now China has made no reply to Khrushchev's attacks and, in my opinion, it is not acting well. The modern revisionists have gone over to a new phase of their

struggle against Marxism-Leninism. In the first phase, violating the Moscow Statement, they attacked us, and Khrushchev, with disgraceful methods, managed to compromise a series of party leaders, and to involve them and their propaganda in this dirty struggle against the Party of Labour of Albania and Marxism-Leninism. We resisted the attacks, exposed them, and our struggle had success. Now the revisionists are going further down their road of betrayal and want no hobbles on their feet. Hence, facing defeats, they are trying to bring about the polarization of revisionists, moving towards new compromises with imperialism, continuing the struggle against us with the same methods, but this time they are openly attacking the Communist Party of China from the congresses of other parties. This was done at the congresses which have been held in Italy, Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Bulgaria. **This activity was capped with the speech that Khrushchev delivered on the 12th of this month in the Supreme Soviet of the SU, and it will continue with two objectives: either to intimidate China, force it to its knees, or cause it to go on the offensive and achieve the split, because now the unity is formal.**

China is seeking a meeting! This is of no advantage to the revisionists, but if they come around to it in the end, not in the interest of unity, but of a split, first they will continue to attack China roundly in order to discredit it, to deeply compromise the leaders and the communist and workers' parties in this new, open campaign against China, and then, when they have prepared it, they may accept the meeting, to put China with its back to the wall, and say: «Either surrender, or get out! You are to blame!». China has to understand these plots and must not fall for them.

SUNDAY
DECEMBER 23, 1962

WE HAVE DIFFERENCES OVER TACTICS WITH THE CHINESE COMRADES, AND THIS WE HAVE NOT HIDDEN FROM THEM

At a dinner which the Chinese comrades put on in Peking for a group of our building specialists, amongst other things, in his speech Li Hsien-nien repeated that **we would be quite unable to build the new projects which we receive from China and bring them into production at the time decided.** Speaking about modern revisionism, he said that there were contradictions between the Party of Labour of Albania and the Communist Party of China (without specifying them), but they were in agreement on the general line.

What he said about the construction of the new projects is not true, because he has no facts at all, since the work is not even begun. He could have said that the Chinese are not delivering the blue-prints on time. This is what is hindering and delaying the construction of the projects and it is Li Hsien-nien who is insisting on and spreading his baseless idea, also, among the other comrades of the Chinese leadership that we are allegedly incapable of building the new projects. For our part, we will mobilize ourselves and prove the opposite.

As for the contradictions, it would be more correct for him to say that we have differences over tactics, and they know of these, which we have not hidden from them. We cannot blindly follow the Communist Party of China in the forms and tempo of their actions.

MONDAY
DECEMBER 24, 1962

THE STANDS OF THE CHINESE COMRADES ARE IMPROPER IN SEVERAL DIRECTIONS

I think that the stands of the Chinese comrades on the questions which are concerning us are improper in several directions. Regardless of this, we have assumed all the responsibilities. We are on the right road, and sooner or later everyone will understand this road and will follow it.

All the modern revisionists without exception have organized the great orchestra against the Party of Labour of Albania in order to discredit it in the eyes of the whole world. Even what pertains to China they hurl at us. Their aim is to attack their main enemy, the Party of Labour of Albania, and, at the same time, to intimidate and discredit the Communist Party of China and to reach the point where it is no longer in solidarity with us, which means to descend to compromise with them.

At a time when the revisionists are acting openly in all directions, the Chinese comrades, although they agree that the revisionists are traitors and that their own relations with the Soviet Union are hanging on a thread, are avoiding the struggle for purely formal reasons, regardless of the fact that patience, too, has a limit. They are holding back to our detriment, to their own detriment and to the detriment of communism.

The Chinese comrades do not understand the conse-

quences of the revisionists' manoeuvre. They are attacking us and openly spreading propaganda that allegedly «the Chinese are behind us», that allegedly we are «the Chinese loudspeaker» and «sold out to the Chinese». This propaganda of theirs means that they are attacking China. **China is seeking a meeting, and the worst of it is, in order to strengthen «unity». But it is a puzzle what sort of unity they are thinking about.** If unity can be achieved on correct principles, we, too, are in favour of this. But one or the other side must admit that it has been wrong in principle, otherwise unprincipled compromises are made. This we do not accept. It seems to me that the Chinese comrades have put great hopes on the meeting, and are remaining loyal to this formality (because the way things have gone so far, it cannot be called anything else) up to the point of accepting that they and their allies should be insulted and discredited. I am convinced that this method of action, this tactic, is neither militant nor revolutionary.

WEDNESDAY
DECEMBER 26, 1962

LI HSIEN-NIEN SAID THE OPPOSITE OF WHAT HE HAD SAID EARLIER ABOUT THE CONTRADICTIONS BETWEEN US

At a dinner Chen Yi corrected what Li Hsien-nien had said about the contradictions allegedly existing between our parties. He began his speech with the expression: «Between our parties there is no disagreement, no division, but complete, steel unity», etc. This means that Li Hsien-nien was wrong, or that his comrades do not agree with him. The fact is that at a later dinner, Li Hsien-nien said the opposite of what he had said earlier about the contradictions between us. This time he had his speech written out.

THURSDAY
DECEMBER 27, 1962

DEAD SILENCE IN CHINESE FOREIGN POLICY

Dead silence in Chinese foreign policy. Khrushchev, Tito, Kennedy are striking underhand deals and we shall see what emerges from them. **The Chinese are keeping quiet and it seems they have decided not to reply to Khrushchev. The Chinese are making efforts, through the communist and workers' parties which take a vacillating, centrist stand, to bring about the calling of a meeting of the communist and workers' parties of the world. These «allies» will dump you in the middle of the road whenever it suits them, they are for meetings of compromise.** Khrushchev is able to hold such a meeting whenever he likes, and these «allies» will always be on his side, but what he wants most is the liquidation of the Party of Labour of Albania and the submission of the Communist Party of China. Khrushchev is fighting to create the conditions in this direction, while China is holding back, dragging its feet, you might say, on this issue.

1963

THURSDAY
JULY 4, 1963

ANOTHER STALE COMMUNIQUE

China again reaffirms that the delegation which goes to Moscow for talks will show patience, etc., etc. China again issued a communique in connection with this meeting, a stale communique, which, to my mind, was unnecessary. And what for? The communist world is becoming convinced and will become even more convinced about Khrushchev's betrayal, will expose him, and tear the mask from this traitor. Someone, like... is advising patience, patience. The Chinese are talking about patience, too. But I believe that they are thinking differently, because it would be astonishing if after all these things which the revisionists are saying and doing, they have not become fed up with them.

FRIDAY
JULY 5, 1963

A MEETING WHICH WILL NOT YIELD ANY RESULT

The delegation of the Communist Party of China, headed by Teng Hsiao-ping, has arrived in Moscow. It was given a pompous farewell in Peking as if it were going to a wedding, while in Moscow it had an icy reception like a funeral.

We shall see what this worthless, formal meeting will yield. I am sure that it will not yield any result; on the contrary, it will show how right we were to dot the i's. What result can be achieved in talks with the Khrushchevite traitors when they have affirmed at the plenum of their Central Committee that they will not retreat even a fraction from their line? With this the Khrushchevites want to say: Step back, you Chinese, and come and join our dance!

Go and talk «patiently», if you wish, with the Khrushchevites, under these conditions.

THURSDAY
JULY 11, 1963

TODAY THE CHINESE ARE SAYING ABOUT KHRUSHCHEV WHAT KHRUSHCHEV SAID YESTERDAY ABOUT TITO

Chen Yi talked to our ambassador in Peking, Reiz Malile, and in substance told him that «the Moscow meeting might be broken off to be continued later, in successive sittings. Such a thing», stressed Chen Yi, «is in the interests of both sides». After venting his spleen on Khrushchev, he said: «We must try to prevent him from going over to the imperialists, to prevent him from capitulating, because there is the question of the Soviet people», etc., etc. «We shall go on exposing him all the time», etc., he said in conclusion.

Vacillations can be seen among the Chinese comrades, they are up one minute and down the next and leave the impression that they are not clear on their tactics, but very wobbly; and are often intimidated by the pressure of the Soviets, who are arrogant. The Chinese are saying about Khrushchev today what Khrushchev said about Tito yesterday: «He is an enemy, a Trojan horse, but we must not let him go over to the enemy, must not let him capitulate, because there is the question of the peoples of Yugoslavia», etc. And in the end they kissed and made up with Tito, they became friends, allies and comrades opposed to us. Too bad about the Chinese!!

FRIDAY
JULY 12, 1963

THE CHINESE DO NOT FULLY REALIZE WHAT AN ENEMY KHRUSHCHEV IS

The Chinese still do not fully realize what an enemy Khrushchev is, although the course of this traitor is already clear. He is heading towards agreement with the American imperialists, towards concessions and compromises. Hence, we are not dealing with a person or a group that is making some mistakes, that in the middle of the road sees the disaster looming up ahead and turns back; in this case it would be essential to manoeuvre, without giving way on principles, «to prevent him from going over to the imperialists». But with Khrushchev it is not at all in order, or correct, even to consider, let alone do such a thing. He has betrayed completely.

SATURDAY
JULY 13, 1963

«THE-MIDDLE-OF-THE-ROADERS» LEAN MOSTLY TO THE RIGHT

The Chinese comrades are temporizing in vain. The extreme zigzags which they think have their pluses, have also many minuses. «The-middle-of-the-roaders», as the Chinese describe those parties which say they are against Khrushchev, but which don't come out openly either against him or for us, cannot be won with these stands. They are for a policy of «reel in but don't break the line», «don't make matters worse», «wait and see»; they are leaning mostly to the right. Therefore, such a thing is favourable to Khrushchev and his gang. But I am convinced that the traitor can't be stopped in his course in this way. He will go ahead and continue his betrayal. It won't be long before time proves this even more clearly.

SUNDAY
JULY 14, 1963

THE VAIN HOPES OF THE CHINESE COMRADES HAVE GONE WITH THE WIND

Today the Soviets issued an open letter, a vicious letter, with quite open attacks on the Chinese leadership. The vain hopes of the Chinese comrades have gone with the wind. I believe, and I have no doubt, that now they have no other way to go to except the correct revolutionary road of our Party. The letter is full of fabrications, slanders and distortions. Attacks constitute the entire essence of this letter, which is rather like a long, demagogic article for sentimental fools and cowards. There is one thing running through the whole letter: **The Chinese leaders are splitters, dogmatists, therefore they must be condemned and isolated, because they are dangerous. The Albanians are tools of the Chinese and the others are renegades, etc.**

MONDAY
JULY 15, 1963

KHRUSHCHEV HAS COME OUT OPENLY. THE TIME HAS COME FOR THE CHINESE TO STRIKE HARD AT THIS DOG

The Soviet letter does not contain any argument to challenge the Chinese documents politically or theoretically with facts. It avoids the key problems as the devil fears holy water, it skirts around them and launches attacks in the most banal journalese. But there is one very good thing about this letter — it helps the communist movement to see more clearly what these traitors are, and impels the Chinese comrades to step up their struggle.

The «round-about» method of the Chinese comrades' reaction, using such terms as «the fraternal party», «a certain leader» and «a certain state», etc., had become stale and indeed had an effect which was not good.

The way Khrushchev has come out now couldn't be more open. Now the time has come for the Chinese to strike hard at this dog, because this is the only way to triumph over Khrushchevite gangsterism.

WEDNESDAY
JULY 17, 1963

THE CHINESE ARE CONTINUING THEIR USELESS TALKS WITH KHRUSHCHEV

The Chinese are continuing their useless talks with the Soviets at a time when Khrushchev is talking, eating, drinking and laughing with A. Harriman, Assistant Secretary of the American Department of State, and with Lord Hailshem, British Minister for Questions of Science and Technology. What a contrast! How far this betrayal is going! Khrushchev himself is leading the talks, he has cast the dignity of the Soviet Union at the feet of the imperialists, but as for the dignity of communism, he cannot come within miles of it, because he himself is not a communist, but one of the filthiest revisionists.

It is rather surprising that the Chinese continue to waste their efforts on these traitors. There is a limit to patience. They may be able to stomach it, but we would have got up and left. There is no point in continuing any longer, the betrayal is flagrant.

MONDAY
JULY 22, 1963

THE BETRAYERS OF MARXISM-LENINISM MUST BE FOUGHT WITHOUT MERCY

Yesterday Teng Hsiao-ping finally left Moscow for Peking where Mao himself met him at the airport. Of course, they will issue some sort of communique to say that they achieved nothing.

It is useless to talk with the betrayers of Marxism-Leninism, since they are traitors. It is useless to talk with the revisionists since they are renegades from Marxism-Leninism. They must be fought and unmasked without mercy.

MONDAY
JULY 29, 1963

NOT CAPITULATION, BUT STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISTS

In short articles the Chinese continue to inform their people and party about the various insults and attacks of the modern revisionists on the Chinese leadership. They are also pointing out the praises which world capitalism is heaping on Khrushchev and his treacherous line. This is their business. **But on the other hand, they are not informing the Chinese people about the views of the Party of Labour of Albania, which is defending Marxism-Leninism, exposing the treacherous line of Khrushchev and company, and defending China and its Communist Party.** The Chinese comrades are not right on this question. They are sticking to their old tactic, to the stand which they maintained at the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. This tactic is no longer valid, it is an anachronism and harmful to the communist movement. The failure of the Chinese comrades to publish articles from the newspaper «Zëri i popullit» in their press shows fear on their part. Thus, they are displaying vacillation on this question, and this is neither right nor principled. The Chinese comrades are not advancing in step with events and the times.

If they think that they should not publish our articles allegedly to avoid Khrushchev's slander that the Albanians are tools of China, this is absurd, because the

Khrushchevite revisionists are not hesitating at all to use this action of the Chinese as something to their advantage, by trying to discredit us and, especially, to present our correct stand as isolated. China is assisting them in this direction with the stands it is adopting. If China is not publishing our articles in the belief that it will place in a difficult position the other fraternal parties, like those of Korea, Indonesia and Vietnam, which are still not maintaining a public stand in defence of China, this, too, is not right tactically.

According to the Chinese tactic we ought to retreat, to go back to the stands of the Koreans, the Vietnamese, or even worse, of the Indonesians. No! This we shall never do! They must move forward, and so must China. Marxism must be defended, and defended strongly, against traitors and renegades. All these comrades know Khrushchev; amongst themselves they say that he has betrayed, that he is linking up with the Americans, that he is causing socialism to degenerate, that he is attacking them openly, but on the other hand they are delaying their struggle, waiting. **What are they waiting for? This is strange. There is a question mark about the future in this. Either struggle with the revisionists or capitulation! We shall press on in the fight.**

The line Khrushchev is following conforms to and serves the policy of the American imperialists. The treaty «On the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons», which was signed recently in Moscow, is conceived and dictated by the Americans and accepted without any alteration by Khrushchev. The American imperialists wanted the monopoly of nuclear weapons, Khrushchev gave it to them. The Americans talk about «peace», and so does this lackey of the bourgeoisie, Khrushchev, but meanwhile the Americans are preparing for war, increasing the stocks of atomic bombs for themselves and their friends, while Khrush-

chev is disarming his own friends, and, with his pacifism, is disarming the peoples. This means to assist the Americans. One side is armed — the Americans, one side is disarmed — Khrushchev's friends, and the two are jointly attacking China, Albania, accusing them of being warmongers, etc. It is clear even to the blind, let alone to the Marxists, where and in what direction the modern revisionists, with the traitors Khrushchev-Tito-Ulbricht-Gomulka-Novotny-Zhivkov, etc., at the head, are going with their efforts.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 6, 1963

THE CHINESE BATTERIES OPEN UP AGAINST MODERN REVISIONISM

China has begun to publish a series of articles in reply to the open letter of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The first article, treating the theme of the differences», which we read today, was very good. Now the Chinese batteries have opened up. This is a great victory for Marxism-Leninism. The exposure of the traitors could wait no longer. The cup had been filled to overflowing even earlier.

Now we are entering a new, more advanced phase of the struggle against modern revisionism, we are entering the phase of the overall organization of the struggle of the communists throughout the world.

1964

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 1, 1964

OUR GUESTS WERE VERY SATISFIED

Yesterday, at the airport, we welcomed the Government delegation of the PR of China, headed by Chou En-lai, in which Chen Yi is also taking part. At the airport, where there were nearly three thousand people, the guard of honour was lined up. Chou En-lai emerged smiling from the aircraft and embraced us joyfully. In an open car, we passed through the streets of Tirana packed with people, who were all enthusiasm, with flags and flowers in their hands.

After lunch, Chou En-lai paid us a formal visit, while in the evening we went to the Club of the «Stalin» textile combine amongst the workers, then to the Central House of Officers, and to the Writes' and Artists' Club, where all were celebrating the New Year. The welcome everywhere has been extremely enthusiastic. Our guests were very pleased.

We passed New Year's Eve very well at the Palace of Brigades with all the comrades. At the dinner I and Chou En-lai both spoke.

This evening we went to the Opera and Ballet Theatre and saw a beautiful concert, which our guests liked very much. The cheering of the audience for the Albanian-Chinese friendship was ardent and heartfelt.

THURSDAY
JANUARY 9, 1964

CHOU EN-LAI'S VISIT IS OVER

Today Chou En-lai left our country. His coming here aroused great interest within the country and in the international arena. Our people gave the representative of the Chinese people and the Communist Party of China an affectionate welcome, because we are linked with them in a sincere friendship on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

The Party of Labour of Albania and our people, in the first place, with China and its party, are determined in the struggle against world imperialism, headed by American imperialism, and against modern revisionism, headed by the traitor groups of Khrushchev and Tito. The common struggle, especially at the present moments, has strengthened and tempered our great friendship.

The great importance of China in the international arena is known, therefore world opinion is following Chou En-lai's journey with interest, and the papers are full of news about it. Naturally, the imperialists and the different reactionaries are waiting to see what the outcome of Chou En-lai's visit to us will be in regard to China's stand towards Khrushchev's absurd and deceptive proposals about the cessation of polemics. They are interested in both sides of the medal. If the polemic with the revisionists ceases, they benefit, because the renegade Khrushchev can continue his betrayal in peace. For our part, the cessation of the polemic will never occur, and

the Chinese, for their part, have confirmed that they will not cease the polemic.

On the other hand, the imperialists are interested in the continuation of the polemic in order to get the Khrushchev group more deeply into their clutches. We do not want this traitor in our ranks and will do everything possible to isolate him from the Soviet people, the Soviet communists, and international communism.

Chou En-lai's visit to us is very important because it is much different to see things with your own eyes from reading them in the reports of Lo Shi-gao, the Chinese Ambassador to Tirana. Chou En-lai and Chen Yi saw for themselves the strength of our Party, its strong links with the broad masses of the people, saw the steel unity of the people, the Party and the leadership; they saw and were powerfully affected by the confidence and enthusiasm of the masses in the construction of socialism, saw the confidence and courage of the people, the Party and the army in the defence of the country and the independence and sovereignty of our Homeland. Wherever they went, they saw the flourishing of our agriculture, industry, education and culture.

This is a great victory for Albania, because in this way the Chinese comrades, the Chinese people and party, build up their trust and love for our people and our Party. Such a friendship is necessary for Albania, which does not need platonic, idealist friendship, but real friendship based on Marxism-Leninism.

I think our talks went very well. We understood our guests and they understood us. For our part, in the exposition which I gave, and in the summing-up of the joint talks, our views were expressed openly, without any reserve, on all the problems, on strategy and tactics. We formed the belief that the Chinese comrades, also, expressed themselves openly and without any reserve.

We understand the major role of China, we understand the special situation and the great responsibility which every word, every move and act of its leaders has. Likewise, the Chinese comrades understand our situation, the advanced positions our Party has gained against modern revisionism, and they found these positions of ours correct and Marxist-Leninist. The tactic of the struggle which we are using and will continue to use, also, has its theoretical basis and does not overlook the strategy.

In connection with the question of how we understand unity, our side stressed the need to consult each other more frequently in order to co-ordinate our joint actions.

But what is very important, and this came out both in the official and unofficial talks, is that now the Chinese comrades have no illusions about Khrushchev, that, like us, they consider him an inveterate traitor. However, Chou En-lai's exposition of the tactics which we should use in the struggle against revisionism was a bit long-winded. It gave the impression that Chou was using many phrases to convince us about something which «he couldn't say openly», because it might arouse our opposition. Our only fear was that they might raise this question: Would it be possible and necessary, in specific instances, to reach a compromise with the Khrushchev group against imperialism? We expressed our opinion openly to Chou En-lai, stressing that we would make no concession to Khrushchev, would reach no compromise with him, because he is a traitor. Any attempt at rapprochement on his part would be demagogy and a fraud to gain time in order to get out of difficulties. On this question, Chou En-lai did not express himself very clearly, as we did, but he approved our stand. He agreed on those opinions we expressed about Khrushchev and, finally, on the pretext that perhaps the interpreter might not have given a good translation, did

not fail to add that, when he spoke about a compromise (and this not on the question of a compromise with Khrushchev), he had in mind a Marxist-Leninist compromise.

In a word, as Chou En-lai presented the problems, on the question of tactics in general, we had no reason to disagree with him. On some occasions and in some specific circumstances, which are also linked with our advanced positions, we shall act on the basis of our line, always with caution, of course, but bearing in mind at every moment our great common interest.

We believe that time will prove that the Chinese comrades will advance more rapidly than they think. They are of the opinion that they have a broad view of the problems — that is their business, but matters must be taken up in time and one should react to them with the tempo that the situation demands. This in no way means that all our predictions, or all the conclusions we reach are infallible, correct and precise. Therefore, exchange of opinions, as frequently as possible, is very useful. The Chinese comrades may have more facts, elaborate them and naturally draw conclusions. We may see matters from some other angles, therefore, if we jointly exchange opinions, a more complete conclusion can emerge.

Chou En-lai received our ideas on the perspective plan for the coming five-year period favourably. He found them in order and promised that China would assist us in the processing of oil, chromium, copper, iron-nickel, etc. In a word, he considered the economic problems we raised correct and in order, and later, when we have the draft five-year plan ready, the Chinese will study our requests concretely. Chou En-lai was interested in the problem of labour power, which has been a continual worry to us. He considered correct the great care we exercise to avoid

draining the population from the villages and to use the labour power in the cities as much as possible. Naturally, the question of bread was considered by both sides. Of course, this key problem for us will begin to be solved, especially when we have chemical fertilizers. Chou En-lai found our orientation towards the further development of grain growing in the mountain regions also in case of a war situation interesting.

The results achieved in the talks we can consider satisfactory, both to us and to them, from both the political and the economic aspects. This will further strengthen our friendship, will assist to strengthen the political and economic situation in our country, and strengthen the international position of our country even more.

FRIDAY
MARCH 6, 1964

FIRE TO THE END AGAINST SOVIET REVISIONISTS!

The Chinese have informed us of a reply to a letter of theirs handed to the Soviets on the 1st of March in connection with a document which the latter sent, after their recent plenum, to all communist and workers' parties with the exception of the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania. The Soviet letter is very dirty, it attacks the Communist Party of China as a hooligan, and at the same time threatens it. The Chinese party has replied to the Soviets blow-for-blow and sent us a copy of their reply.

We shall see how the Soviets react in connection with the proposals for a meeting. But I think they will grab at this issue, **especially now, that the Rumanians are going to Peking in order to press, at all costs, for cessation of the polemic, even for a short time.** The enemy is trying to grab you, even by the finger-tip, then your arm, and in the end, your head. **In no way must the polemic be stopped! Fire to the end against the Soviet revisionists!**

FRIDAY
APRIL 17. 1964

THE LACKEYS DECORATE KHRUSHCHEV. THE CHINESE LEADERSHIP SENDS HIM A TELEGRAM OF CONGRATULATIONS

In Moscow, yesterday and today, Khrushchev's lackeys awarded him decorations from the «Gold Star» to the «Order of the Lion» on his birthday. This is like the story of the Bible which tells how the Three Wise Men of the East carried gifts to Jesus. The lackeys are trying to keep up the bankrupt's prestige. **Telegrams of hosanna are reaching Khrushchev from all sides, but the most unpleasant and completely wrong one is that from the Chinese comrades. The Chinese telegram of congratulations was written with their feet and not their head. Whatever the excuse the Chinese comrades may try to put up, none will hold water. Their act is a political and ideological class mistake.** We can never agree to this act of theirs and we shall find the opportunity to tell them so, if not directly, certainly indirectly. **Today we shall strip Khrushchev of his title of «Honoured Citizen» of the city of Tirana, with the motivation that a traitor such as he deserves.** Thus, this important political act will be a «decoration» in our style for this revisionist and, at the same time, an answer to the telegrams which the Chinese, Koreans, Vietnamese, and others sent him.

POGRADEC, THURSDAY
AUGUST 6, 1964

THERE IS SOMETHING HIDDEN HERE

Nesti Nase informed us from Peking that during his talk with Chou En-lai, when he put forward the project for our demarche to the Rumanians, Chou implied that it did not quite please the Chinese, that it should be left for later, that we should co-ordinate these actions in October, on the occasion of China's National Day, when our delegation is to go there, too.

There is something hidden here. This is not clear to us, because, on the other hand, Chou considered the theses we are going to put forward to the Rumanians correct. Chou En-lai said that those were his personal opinions, but that he would inform the leadership. Then, on this occasion, he said that he would send us the minutes of the talks which they have held with the Rumanians, and which we did not know about. Chou also said that he had gone *incognito* to Korea and Vietnam, had talked with the leaders of these countries about these things, and expressed his regret that we were so far away, and that it was impossible to act in that way with us, too. This is very surprising! We shall see! Everything will be explained sooner or later.

TUESDAY
AUGUST 18, 1964

THIS MEANS TO TURN WHICHEVER WAY THE WIND BLOWS

Prompted by the tactic which we are going to adhere to at the Rumanian celebration, the Chinese leadership has informed us of its tactic. **The Chinese delegation will stand up for the revisionists, but will not applaud, and if they attack China by name, it is not going to walk out.** Hence, the disagreement will appear publicly here. What of it? This will be a good thing, too. It would be good if the Chinese were to have the same stand as us, but nothing can be done about it, we cannot adopt their stand, because it would be wrong in principle.

Together with this, the Chinese tell us that their leadership understands why Rumania is taking credits from the imperialists and pursuing a conciliatory policy with the Titoites, for it has no alternative, otherwise Rumania would be ruined. This view of the Chinese comrades is completely revisionist. In other words, the Chinese hold that credits from the United States of America can be accepted, and believe that socialism can be assisted by imperialism. The Chinese are right off the beam here! Let alone on the Titoite question! The Chinese are forgetting what they said and wrote earlier. **This means to turn whichever way the wind blows.** No! We will never agree with these opportunist views of the Chinese comrades! What becomes of the theses that «so-

cialism must be built on the basis of self-reliance», when, according to them, you can accept credits even from the United States of America?

The Chinese will cause great damage if they get into such blind alleys. Why will Rumania be ruined? Why were we, who did not accept credits from the imperialists, not ruined? **Or can it be that with what they tell us, the Chinese want to imply to us at the same time that we were saved by some credits which they gave us, otherwise we would have been ruined?! This would be the culmination of infamy! They are right off the beam, and have not understood our correct, unwavering Marxist-Leninist line. It is only on the basis of the correct line of a party that socialism can be built. Credits and aid from friends are secondary and a consequence of this correct line.**

The Chinese are gravely mistaken on this question. How have they come to make this mistake? Is it possible that in the talks with the Rumanians, the content of which we do not know, they are swimming in the same waters? In this communication the Chinese leadership confirms that it agrees with Chou En-lai's opinions in regard to the demarche we shall make to the Rumanians. In other words, the Chinese leadership is supposed to be of the opinion that the things we are going to say to the Rumanians are correct, but they would prefer them not to be said now, be left for later, and be said by an important person, because possibly Dej might take them amiss, that Tito is not the main and most dangerous enemy, and other such unclear, wavering ideas, incomprehensible to us. What is hidden behind all this? One thing is interesting: when we informed the Chinese comrades that we were going to put forward certain matters of principle to the Rumanians, they immediately told us of the talks they had held secretly with Dej as early as

June 5, and promised us that they would give us the minutes. So that must be where the snag lies. When they give us these minutes we shall have a clearer view of the stand of the Chinese towards the opportunist line of the Rumanians and these non-comradely games they are up to towards us.

We are sincere with the Chinese comrades, and we shall continue to be so. We shall not budge from our line, because it is correct, and we shall speak our minds openly on everything to everybody.

FRIDAY
AUGUST 21, 1964

THE CHINESE ARE IN NATIONAL-CHAUVINIST POSITIONS

We received from Peking the minutes of the «cordial» meeting of the Chinese ambassador with Dej (five hours and a familiar lunch), Bodnaras' talk with China's ambassador (seven hours of secret meeting on the shores of a lake which went on till 3 a.m.), and Chou En-lai's talk with the Rumanian ambassador in Peking.

It is clear that the Chinese felt themselves in an embarrassing position towards us, that is why they informed us about these talks and contacts, because they could have kept them secret from us. **The stand of the Chinese towards the centrist and nationalist views of the Rumanians is not correct, but mistaken and opportunist.**

In informing the Chinese about their disagreements with Khrushchev, the Rumanians are bragging about their «courage» and «rabid» opposition to the Soviets, they are cocky about «this valour» and boastful about «their wisdom» and their «sensational discovery» of a «new» and «correct line». It is true that the Rumanians are proving skilful in pleasing the Chinese, playing on the chord which pleases them and making efforts to draw them into certain actions of conciliation with the other revisionists. Such is the suggestion they have made, that it would be good if, before Chou En-lai goes to Rumania, he were to visit first Poland and Hungary. Apart from this, in Bodnaras' talk with the

Chinese ambassador, we find the «reason» why the Chinese now underestimate the danger of Tito, why Bodnaras presents Tito as an «opponent of Khrushchev», **because: «Tito opposed Khrushchev ever the meeting and the expulsion of the Communist Party of China from the socialist camp and international communism»**, «Tito supports Rumania with good will» and other such tales and fiendish tactics of Tito.

It seems that the Chinese like all this, that they readily believe these manoeuvres. In the conversation between Dej and the Chinese ambassador, Tito was not mentioned at all (it would not be surprising if they have removed this piece from the minutes).

The stand of the Rumanians is clear. But what is interesting is the stand of Chou En-lai in his talk with the Rumanian ambassador, a talk on a completely wrong course and from a nationalist position towards the Soviet Union. Chou En-lai raises with the Rumanians territorial claims against the Soviet Union. He accuses the Soviet Union (Lenin and Stalin because, this «robbery», according to Chou En-lai, took place in their time) of having seized Chinese, Japanese, Polish, German, Czech, Rumanian, Finnish, and other territories. On the other hand, Chou En-lai tells the Rumanians that they are doing well to claim the territories which the Soviet Union has seized from them.

These are not Marxist-Leninist, but national-chauvinist positions. Regardless of whether or not mistakes may have been made, to raise these things now, when we are faced, first of all, with the ideological struggle against modern revisionism, means not to fight Khrushchev, but on the contrary to assist him on his chauvinist course. What a line the Chinese have! On the one hand they defend Stalin, on the other they make him out a robber. They forget that raising territorial claims at this time

(even when fully justified, as is the case with Kosova for us) leads to the creation of a situation of military conflict.

We are opposed to the view of the traitor Khrushchev on the question of borders. But to put it this way, as Chou En-lai does, is also utterly wrong. We cannot reconcile ourselves to these views of the Chinese comrades, because they are anti-Marxist.

Moreover, apart from this, the Chinese are making a major tactical error in telling the Rumanians of these views, urging them on an evil course and trying to achieve rapprochement with them through wrong principles and tactics.

Now it is clear why the Chinese do not want us to hold the talk we have decided on with the Rumanians, because it is in flagrant opposition to the Chinese views. We do not want to make approaches to the Rumanians, or encourage them by blandishment, or by showing ourselves to be opportunists towards them, but by openly telling them the truth, the principles, the right course, the correct policy, the correct and resolute defence of Marxism-Leninism.

In their talks with the Chinese, the Rumanians do not raise these things at all, and they have no reason to raise them, because ideologically they are in revisionist, Titoite positions.

The Chinese are making a grave mistake, we must help them.

POGRADEC, SATURDAY
AUGUST 22, 1964

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST KHRUSHCHEVISM MUST NOT BE DIVERTED INTO TERRITORIAL CLAIMS

The views which Chou En-lai expressed to the Rumanian ambassador in Peking are very alarming.

Chou En-lai is making a grave mistake that he is inciting the Rumanians to make territorial claims on the Soviet Union. This is not the right way to bring the Rumanians close to our line. This is neither the time nor the occasion to raise such problems which provide Khrushchev with a weapon to accuse us of being chauvinists. **The ideological and political struggle against Khrushchev must not be diverted into delicate questions of territorial claims.** From the ideological and political positions which they adhere to, as well as from the military angle, the Rumanian leaders, for their part, have not raised the question of territorial claims on the Soviet Union and neither will they do so. If the Rumanians do this they will lose in all directions, because others will raise more claims on them. Therefore, **the raising of claims and the way Chou En-lai has done it is not right, either in principle, or as a tactic of the moment.**

The Rumanians will certainly not approve Chou's raising this problem, they will judge this as a naive idea

of the Chinese leaders and, moreover, will form a bad opinion of them over this.

Even more important is the fact that Chou En-lai did not raise the question of territorial claims simply as a tactic, but as an issue of principle. **The claims of the Chinese have been built on a dangerous platform and from a nationalist position, to the point that they themselves have pretentions to Outer Mongolia. This platform has nothing in common with the struggle against Khrushchevism and Krushchev.**

The Chinese want the re-examination of all borders with the Soviet Union by all states.

The raising of this problem at these moments is not correct. On the contrary, it is a grave error of principle. Even if we suppose they are just, the territorial claims cannot be settled at these moments, on the contrary, they strengthen the chauvinist positions of Khrushchev and, at the same time, assist Khrushchev in the unprincipled, treacherous struggle he has waged and is waging against Stalin.

This is scandalous. In no way can we accept it.

The territorial integrity of the Soviet Union must not be touched at this time, notwithstanding that history may have left problems to be tidied up. Today the whole struggle must be directed against the Khrushchevite renegades, but not with such arguments and methods as the Chinese are using.

Mao has made a great mistake in raising the question of claims with the Japanese socialists.

These actions are not correct. When Chou En-lai was here he did not raise these things at all and in these forms that we are hearing of now. Had he raised this problem with us, we would have opposed him, but regard-

less of this, we must find the way, the most suitable time, and quickly, too, to tell them of our opinion on these major issues of principle.

Comrade Stalin was very correct, prudent, and principled in these delicate and complicated problems. At the period of the gravest crisis in relations with Titoite Yugoslavia, when the hostility between us and the Titoites had reached its culmination, when all of us were in struggle against the revisionists of Belgrade, who had set themselves against socialism and the communist movement, in a talk which I had with Stalin he said to me. among other things, that from the formal aspect the Yugoslav Federation, as a union of different republics, was progressive. Seen from this viewpoint, there was no reason for it to be broken up, but Titoism and the Titoites must be fought ideologically and politically as betrayers of Marxism-Leninism. The struggle against them must not be waged from the chauvinist positions of territorial claims or against the peoples of Yugoslavia, but the nations which comprise it must be assisted so that they enjoy the right to self-determination up to separation from the Federation. We must not harm or attack Yugoslavia or the Yugoslav peoples, but must convince them that they have a treacherous leadership which is leading them to disaster. Let the Yugoslav peoples speak for themselves, let the Yugoslav communists speak for themselves.

This was the principled stand of Stalin, and we were and are completely in agreement with this stand. **The questions of territorial claims for all those countries which the Chinese comrades mention can be raised only when revisionism has been routed and Marxist-Leninist bolshevik parties have come to the head of those countries.** Then the problems of disputed borders can be raised and discussed, as amongst Marxist-Leninists, in the spirit of

proletarian internationalism, and just solutions found in favour not only of simple national interests, but also of international communism.

There is no other road. Any other road is wrong, and I think that the Chinese comrades have fallen up to their ears into this grave error.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 4, 1964

THE CHINESE ARE MAKING GROSS AND IMPERMISSIBLE MISTAKES

We gave the Chinese our reply in connection with the question of invitations to the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic. In the reply, we criticized them severely but justly, because they are making gross and impermissible mistakes.

First, we told them that it is quite inconceivable and unacceptable that the delegation of the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Rumanian Government should take part in the celebration, and representatives of friendly parties and countries should not take part. We think that it is not in order to cloud a major question which is clear, or to raise unnecessary difficulties over it, because of an issue of tactics or diplomatic reciprocity. We cannot conceive how the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Rumanian Government, which up till yesterday were publicly attacking all of us, which have been in complete solidarity with all the modern revisionists, and which have revisionist ideological and political stands at present (and very likely will have in the future), can be the only party and the only state which are represented at the great celebration of the Chinese people. **We do not consider it right that the only party and government to attend your great celebration should be that party and government which yesterday, at the 20th anniversary**

of their liberation, came out with a centrist-revisionist report; which took the greatest care to avoid attacking American imperialism and the modern revisionists even with one word; which have very friendly links with the major renegade Tito; which are establishing friendly relations and receiving credits from American imperialism and the other imperialists.

What will the communists throughout the world think when they see that the Rumanians have pride of place at China's celebration, and the Marxist-Leninist parties do not figure anywhere? It is good not to imply in any way, even from the surface of things, that the Communist Party of China approves the centrist line of the Rumanians and has cooled towards its loyal Marxist-Leninist allies.

The Rumanians do not base their struggle against the renegade group of Khrushchev on Marxism-Leninism, but only on economic contradictions, or certain national chauvinist considerations. We must show ourselves very prudent and cautious in the steps we take with them. This is our opinion, which can change only to the extent that the position of the Rumanians changes positively.

It is right that you have invited many delegations of non-communist friends to the celebration. But to invite only these and the Rumanian Party and Government to your celebration, and not invite the Marxist-Leninist parties is not acceptable to party and world opinion.

Second, we wrote that we consider incorrect the decision that, at the great celebration of the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, in which many friends of China will take part, the official representatives of peoples most faithful to the Chinese people, the official representatives of communist and workers' parties which take a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist stand and which are fighting the most ferocious

enemies, world imperialism and its modern revisionist agents, are excluded. **This is an action which, at these moments, no tactical considerations, or especially the internal tactics amongst our parties, can justify.** Neither our people nor our Party will understand this. Even in the extreme case, if we tell them the «reasons» which impel you to take this decision, we assure you that they will still not understand.

We think that **neither the fraternal Chinese people, nor the Chinese communists, will be pleased when they see that their closest friends are not present at their great celebration.**

On the other hand, we think that this will be an astonishing thing, beyond understanding, for world opinion and will be interpreted at will, in many ways.

Third, we wrote, you have taken this decision so that the revisionist renegades should not accuse you of holding a meeting before them, and hence accuse you as splitters! We think that such reasoning is not correct. The meeting which Khrushchev is organizing for the 15th of December has another character and aim, while the celebration of the People's Republic of China is the 15th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China and nothing else. The delegations which are invited to your celebration are not coming to hold special secret meetings, but to celebrate the 15th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China. It is natural that delegations of our parties might exchange opinions. This is our right and we are not afraid of anybody over this. The modern revisionists are holding hundreds of meetings on every possible occasion, and have not waited for us to hold meetings. In fact, we have not held any meeting which they could use to accuse us of being splitters. Despite this, the enemies have not failed to

accuse us every day, but however they slander us, they do not frighten us. Slanders are second nature to them.

They long ago decided on and announced the meeting which they are preparing to hold in Moscow on the 15th of December, and did not wait to see what we would do at the celebration of the 15th anniversary of the People's Republic of China. The revisionists know, also, that we shall not take part at this meeting in Moscow. Hence, the Moscow Meeting is not brought about by our going to China for the celebration. They will accuse us who go to China's celebration not only as splitters, — because this accusation is their main leitmotif, — not that our going to the celebration brought about the Moscow Meeting as a reaction, — because, as we said, they had decided on the meeting previously, — but they will say that in the last analysis, we met in Peking to re-emphasize our steel unity in further actions against them. What harm is there in this for us? None. But one thing is true: they will tremble at our going to Peking. It is a good and desirable thing that they should shake with fright.

Hence, even if the tactic that «the revisionists must take the first step» is accepted, we do not take this «privilege» from them on this occasion by coming to your celebration. We are not holding any meeting in Peking. We have no knowledge of such a meeting and are not prepared for it. In conclusion, we think that the celebration in Peking is in no way analogous to the Moscow Meeting of renegades from Marxism-Leninism.

We think that with the decision you have taken about your celebration, you are creating a difficult situation for our celebration of the 20th anniversary of Liberation. We have thought to invite you, the Koreans, the Vietnamese, the Japanese, the New Zealanders, the Indonesians, the leaders of Marxist-Leninist groups, and the Rumanians to our great celebration. If we do not invite you, who

are we to invite? If you come to us, then what you sought to avoid at your celebration, you will not avoid at all at our celebration. The modern revisionists will say that they met in Tirana in November instead of meeting in Peking in October, and so they will still accuse us of being splitters, since their meeting will be held in December.

If, for tactical reasons, you, the Korean comrades and the Vietnamese comrades, do not come to the jubilee celebration of the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Albania, at a time when you have taken part at the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the liberation of Rumania, world opinion will interpret this act of yours to the detriment of our common cause.

If we adopt the tactic of not inviting you, the three allied and friendly countries and parties, and invite only the Rumanians (a thing which we will not do, even if you don't come), to our celebration, and if tomorrow or the next day the Koreans and the Vietnamese do not invite us, but for reasons of tactics and protocol invite only the Rumanians to their celebrations, then the matter will be interpreted as if our parties and countries have turned out the sound horse (which is our correct Marxist-Leninist line) and are trying to mount a lame horse. Thus, unwittingly, at our political manifestations it will appear as if our political pivot is Rumania. We think this is a mistake which must not be made.

Why should we create complicated situations for our parties and countries with our actions when the issues are clear?

We shall never stop our sacred ideological and political struggle against the modern revisionists with Tito and Khrushchev at the head. If we were to act differently, this would be a colossal mistake for us. We made our tactical stand clear to the Rumanians in the talks which

our comrade, Manush Myftiu, had with Georgiu Dej in Rumania, and we are sure that he and his comrades have no illusions at all that we have shifted or will shift from our principles. And this is a very good thing and may benefit the Rumanians if they still have any good in them. We approach the Rumanians from the principle that telling the truth may taste bitter to them, but the truth is always the truth and must be said.

We tell the Chinese that we are convinced that the opinions which we express to them are sincere. We tell them what we think in an open and comradely way, because for them and for us, the great, sincere, Marxist-Leninist friendship between our parties and peoples stands above everything. We guard and shall always guard this friendship as the apple of our eye. True friendship is based on the great sincerity which exists between friends.

Possibly the Chinese comrades will not be at all pleased with our criticism, but we can't help that, because, I repeat, it is a mistake that only Rumania should be invited to their celebration. This means to publicly take a centrist position.

To invite states and parties to a national celebration is a political question and not a private matter, as if Mao were to invite a person, say, because his son was getting married. This action of the Chinese comrades does not appear to be fortuitous and unconsidered. There is more to this than meets the eye. We must wait and see.

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 15, 1964

THE CHINESE STAND: «THEY TAKE THE FIRST STEP, WE TAKE THE SECOND»

This slogan of action launched by the Chinese comrades against modern revisionists **is not correct for all periods**, as they wish to apply it in the struggle against modern revisionists. In my opinion, **there is nothing revolutionary about it**, it is a slogan of waiting, restraint and the «building of militant revolutionary actions» adjusted to the moves of the opponent. In other words, you should mark time until the opponent makes his move, and adjust your move, naturally with exasperating delay (as the Chinese comrades are doing), according to the way the enemy beats the drum. The tactic of the Chinese is that, if the enemy beats his drum loudly, they beat theirs a little more softly, if the enemy muffles his drum-beat, their own drum should not beat at all.

Throughout the development of the struggle of the Communist Party of China against modern revisionists, and mainly against the Khrushchevites, some «astonishing» vacillations have appeared in its tactic. In my opinion, this tactic can only originate from pronounced lack of clarity on principles over the struggle which must be waged against modern revisionists. Even on stands of principle over basic issues we must say that the Chinese comrades have not always had mature opinions. It cannot be said that this has resulted mainly from their

efforts to find or to apply some appropriate tactic for the events which were developing, or because the Chinese were not fully informed of all the facts which impelled the revisionist enemies to come out against Marxism-Leninism.

To be noted are the moments at the Moscow Meeting in 1957. Comrade Mao publicly praised and supported Khrushchev; in fact he approved his action in denouncing Stalin; approved the condemnation of the «anti-party group of Molotov», etc., and advocated complete unity with the Khrushchev group.

Of course, the Chinese comrades must have been in agreement, in general terms, with Khrushchev over his actions following the death of Stalin even before 1957, because, when I met Comrade Mao in Peking in 1956, in our presence he criticized the «incorrect» activity of Stalin, and especially «Stalin's actions towards Yugoslavia», because according to Mao, Stalin «had made mistakes» and the Yugoslavs were «good Marxist men», and in order to support this «idea» it was precisely the Chinese who were the first and the only ones in that period to invite the Yugoslavs to the Congress of the Communist Party of China.

Why did the Chinese comrades display such short-sightedness towards these events? Can it be said that they had no facts on which to base a stable, principled stand about these things?! Perhaps this might be true, but however few the facts which proved the betrayal of the Khrushchevites, still this could not have been the whole reason which made the Chinese «soft», because there was one major fact, the great work of the bolsheviks led by Stalin over a long period.

If the Chinese comrades had any faith in the work of the bolshevik Stalin, their confidence in and elan towards Krushchev would have been more reserved and

moderate. But the Chinese comrades must have had pent up dissatisfaction towards Stalin, because this was apparent in Mao's statement to the Moscow Meeting, when he said that when he first met Stalin in Moscow, he was «in the role of the school-boy. And though ours were fraternal parties, we were not equal. Whereas,» Mao added, «now that we meet Khrushchev, we are like brothers.» These remarks on Mao's part were a «condemnation» of Stalin, condemnation of the «cult of the individual» and approval of Krushchev's line. This was wrong on Mao's part.

A respectful stand towards Stalin cannot be identified with that disparaging concept of Mao's. Stalin earned that respect and love which all, including Mao, showed for him, with his deeds, and he deserved this for his colossal work, for his glorious struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism. I don't know how Stalin treated Mao, but I, personally, met Stalin many times, and he always tried in every way to give me the feeling of an equal comrade, to create an intimacy. He received me in his home and himself handed me the dish, he sent away the waiters, and we got up and served one another, as in our own homes; Stalin has taken me by the arm and walked with me in his garden, tired himself on my behalf many times, taking the greatest care of me, even over the hat I should wear to avoid getting a cold, and going so far as... to show me where the toilets were if I needed them.

Could you call this stand of Stalin's the stand of «a teacher towards his pupil», **when in fact we were his pupils, and young pupils, before him?** Perhaps Mao was an older pupil, **but still he was a pupil before Stalin.** Since Stalin adopted the stand of a proletarian comrade towards me, imagine what a friendly stand he must have adopted

towards Mao, as the leader of the Communist Party of a big country like China.

Therefore, what Mao said about Stalin at the Moscow Meeting seems to me astonishing, suspect, and said for the occasion, in connection with the new situation created in the Soviet Union.

Could it be that, with what Mao said, he wanted to say to Khrushchev that now, after the death of Stalin «our two countries and two parties are on an equal basis and we two, hand-in-hand, should lead the revolutionary movement»? (This did not suit Khrushchev because, regardless of the bouquets they threw at him, he sat glowering and worried.) Or did he want to say to Krushchev, «You are a new boy, and I am going to help set you on the right course»?

Despite Mao's «modest tone» at the Moscow Meeting, still «his reasonable and correct speech» gave you the impression of a «farseeing», «infallible», «direction-giving» speech.

However, it is true that the Chinese comrades did not take the question of Stalin any further. They quickly drew in their horns, and in the end (with reserve) maintained a stand pro Stalin and against the Khrushchevite traitors. This change was good and correct.

The Moscow Meeting in 1960 put the Chinese comrades, one might say, soundly on the rails on all those capital problems prior to the meeting about which they were not completely clear or had illusions, or on which their tactical stands were wrong, irresolute and hesitating. At any rate, at Bucharest and the Moscow Meeting the disguise was torn from the Khrushchevite revisionists.

It must be said that even after the Meeting, the Chinese comrades did not have a real thorough understanding of the problems. They did not appreciate the danger of the disruptive anti-Marxist activity of the

Khrushchevites in its entirety. The Chinese comrades nurtured illusions and hoped for «some correction». After the Meeting they concentrated more on preventing Khrushchev's attacks on us and on themselves later, than on direct and incisive attacks on the treacherous views which impelled the revisionists to act. Hence, in this way, the Chinese took more notice of the acts (and these they tried to soften or stop) than of their content and aims (which they ought to have fought and exposed).

Hence, after the Moscow Meeting and after the 22nd Congress of the CP of the SU, together with a certain «principled defence» of the Party of Labour of Albania by the Chinese comrades (Chou En-lai), we see an orientation, more of advice, that this kind of «open polemic with the Party of Labour of Albania» should be stopped. In this period, though we were convinced that the Chinese were with us, they did not take open stands directly in defence of the Party of Labour of Albania, for principled and militant solidarity with it, against the Khrushchevites.

In principle, could this be considered to be a wrong tactic of the Chinese for those moments? No, this tactic was not completely wrong, but in our opinion, it would not yield results. Therefore, let them adhere to such a tactic, but not for long, and let them not build up hopes that it would bring the movement good results. Thus, for a long time the Chinese comrades struggled and stood in the position of «stopping the open polemic against the Party of Labour of Albania». However, the attacks on the Party of Labour of Albania by the whole of modern revisionism continued for years on end, and the Party of Labour of Albania, likewise for years on end, struggled heroically alone.

The modern revisionists attacked us furiously, but at the same time, they were fighting Marxism-Leninism,

fighting to spread their revisionist ideas, to consolidate their positions, fighting to intimidate the waverers, and indirectly they were blackmailing the Chinese.

China, one may say, did not engage directly in the struggle against revisionism. It fought when it was prompted, and precisely during this period of exaggerated sluggishness, the Chinese slogan came out, **«The revisionists take the first step and we the second».**

As to how far the revisionists had gone, what point the betrayal by modern revisionists and the Khrushchevites' aims had reached, all these things had become so extremely clear that the static tactic of the Chinese comrades in the «struggle» became exasperating and absurd. We can say that their struggle against the revisionists has been stepped up, has become more emphatic, mostly indirectly, and in the end directly, but it has taken a long time, a great deal of time has been lost, and the slogan of «the first step...» has been applied rigorously on their part. And to bring about this first step, so greatly desired, has required many unnecessary, tiresome stratagems, and why? Over a formal issue: «Who began the attack first, you or we», when the modern revisionists had begun the attack **not just against our Party or some other party, but especially on Marxism-Leninism.**

It was of great and special importance for the Chinese comrades that the modern revisionists should name the Communist Party of China first, and only then should the finger be put on the great sore spot. This tactic is still being applied at present by a number of other fraternal parties of Asia, at a time when the world is on fire. Naturally, this stand is an anachronism, something stale. Even for these parties which have entered the struggle, to a greater or lesser degree, this stale tactic is like a «fig-leaf».

The slogan of «the first step...» which seems «attrac-

tive» superficially, and is considered so important for public opinion, allegedly because «he who starts it is to blame», becomes very harmful when the criminal has unsheathed his sword and is wreaking havoc, while you maintain the forms lest they «accuse you». **But what are you afraid they will accuse you of? Of defending Marxism-Leninism? Our struggle is being waged precisely in defence of Marxism-Leninism.**

Hence, this slogan is holding back the struggle for a great cause for the sake of a formality, which has long been a thing of the past. The importance of our struggle has not been and is not based on whether **«you attacked first and I second»**, but on that **you attacked Marxism-Leninism and I am defending Marxism-Leninism, and public opinion must distinguish as soon as possible, as quickly as possible, and as clearly as possible, who is attacking and who is defending Marxism.** This is the main, decisive, capital issue, and not, «I hit back at you after you attacked me first».

But even if we take the obvious case of the Party of Labour of Albania, which was the first to be attacked by the Khrushchevites, did we close the mouth of the Khrushchevite propaganda, which slanders us and has raised to a theory the idea that **we attacked them first?** No, they are doing their work. Or we want this to go down in history like the famous words of the French officiers at the Battle of Fontenoy: *Messieurs les Anglais, tirez les premiers!** This is absurd when it is a matter of fighting the great enemy in the ranks of the international communist movement.

Under the influence of this slogan the «forecast» was made by the Chinese comrades that **«the struggle will be protracted»**, that **«this struggle will have its ups and**

* «English gentlemen, you shoot first!» (French in the original).

downs». They also decided on ten basic theoretical articles about which they told us that they would print one every fifteen days. Fourteen months have gone by since then and the tenth article has not yet come out, while the modern revisionists, without exaggeration, have written thousands of articles.

Hence rigid, hieratic, olympian tactic, according to the moves of the enemy, but in fact, they don't even follow the moves of the enemy.

Why is this? For tactical reasons? For objective reasons? For subjective reasons? Because the Chinese comrades have failed to define a consistent line?! This is astonishing! Many actions are carried out for form, in order to put the blame formally on one or the other. The Chinese comrades contradict themselves in many of their attitudes. **On the one hand, the Chinese comrades have picked up the final stone against Khrushchev, and say to him, «We are going to put you in your grave», on the other hand they say to him, «Dear Comrade..., many happy returns!»?!**

When they address him as «Dear Comrade...», the Chinese comrades justify this as done «to get closer to the Soviet people». (Interesting, to try to approach the Soviet people by addressing this traitor as «Dear Comrade...»!)

Today they say: «We must struggle for the creation and consolidation of the anti-imperialist front **including even the revisionists»!** Tomorrow Mao makes the famous statement about border claims on the Soviet Union (!!) (with which they want to form an anti-imperialist alliance), and he draws a reply from Khrushchev who tells Mao: You are a Hitler, and if you lay a finger on our borders, 1 have invented a new bomb which will wipe you out completely.

Yesterday Tito was a traitor to the Chinese, later he

was rehabilitated, then he became a traitor again, and now, according to Li Hsien-nien, this great traitor has become a «minor devil».

There are many things like this. The Chinese are very slow to react, and also understand things very slowly. To reflect deeply and to take a correct decision, even though a late one, this is very good, and how it should be, but to put off things for later consideration, and fail to come out with a mature decision, that is very bad. Good decisions must serve for today and tomorrow. Hence, they must foresee the morrow, and tomorrow's decision must be consistent with that of yesterday, and linked with that of the day after tomorrow, that is, all the decisions must be like links in a single chain. Some link in the chain may be weak, and this, naturally, damages the chain, but does not ruin it, but if there are gaps and splits in its links, then it is no longer a chain.

The Chinese comrades say that they have a correct appreciation of time, but they consider it something endless, from positions of passivity, in the sense that it can pass freely, quietly, thinking that «it is working for us». Therefore, they are not concerned about any delay, hence, for them it will be very good if others, too, move at their pace.

It is said that the Chinese comrades are not very pleased to be criticized, although they always say, «Criticize us».

The Chinese comrades are very shut off. They have the capacities and possibilities to extend their horizons, and this they must do. This is absolutely essential. You must know the peoples, their lives, their development and feelings thoroughly, in order to build up a correct Marxist-Leninist policy with them. Otherwise, you will make mistakes or build a stereotyped or schematic line based on formulae and chance happenings and events.

And consequently, you will not understand the crucial moment of the situation, the main link you must grasp to build a far-sighted and correct Marxist-Leninist strategy and tactics.

Although Chou En-lai tried to belittle my opinion that imperialism and revisionism are trying to isolate China and that we should break this isolation, I think that the Chinese comrades ought to have this question constantly in mind. They have to break not only their political and ideological isolation, but also their cultural, commercial and other isolation. All this must be done on the Marxist-Leninist course, without violating principles, without weakening the security of the homeland and the general line, but also without exaggerating the «world» value of Chinese culture and without underrating the culture of other peoples. This cannot have results if it is done in a one-sided way, that is, «If you like what I have, adopt it if you wish, but, on the other hand, I don't like what you have, and I shall not allow my people to taste what you have that is good». These views are not correct, they are not Marxist, they are harmful.

We must find suitable occasions to raise and discuss these and other questions of this nature in a comradely and fraternal way with the Chinese comrades. Perhaps there are some things related to them that we still do not know well enough to understand them in all their extent, therefore, comradely internationalist discussion to the benefit of our common work is always fruitful and advances the work.

Not only we, but the Chinese, too, have great need to thrash out our ideas, to exchange experience with each other on these capital issues, and to more or less define the way we will act, or the methods of work, which may not be identical in form but must be correct in essence,

must be aimed at one or more definite objectives for our great, wide-ranging, complicated cause.

Marxist-Leninist seriousness comes first on the order of the day. Any mistake costs dear; hence fewer mistakes will be made if we consult each other, if we co-ordinate our actions seriously and correctly.

TUESDAY
OCTOBER 6, 1964

OMINOUS SIGNS

Certain unprincipled stands of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, especially some expressed recently, cannot fail to cause us worry:

The question of the Sino-Soviet, Sino-Mongolian borders, and the borders of the European people's democracies, defined after the Second World War. (All this expressed by Mao to the Japanese socialists.)

We wrote a letter to the Chinese comrades on the border problem, and I will not dwell on it now. In connection with this they told our Party and Government delegation, which is in Peking at present, that they would reply to us in writing. But from the talks with Teng Hsiao-ping it emerges that they have been mulling this problem over in their own heads and, in general, they consider their stand correct. They do not look and do not want to look frankly at the danger and incorrectness of this problem. The Chinese comrades regard this as a correct ideological action, which harms Khrushchev and does not help him to use it against the Chinese. This is serious. However, their failing to maintain a Marxist-Leninist stand on this problem, and failing to publish at least everything that Mao discussed with the Japanese, shows that they are in a difficult position, are hesitating, have not yet decided what to do, and thus they are allowing the enemies to speculate about this stand.

The Chinese are whispering excuses that Mao mentioned these questions as «historical facts», saying, «we are not going to raise them with the Soviets, except at the proper time», and «we will reply to them with facts only about the question of Sinkiang», etc.

Teng Hsiao-ping also said that they **disagree with us when we say that Stalin acted correctly, in those circumstances, on the borders of Europe. They think that Stalin did not act correctly and left problems for later, etc.**

For our part, we quite correctly raise the question: **Why are such problems being raised by the Chinese comrades at these moments? Who benefits from this? Why these hesitations, when a clear and decisive stand should be maintained? Why these contradictions in their opinions?**

For the present, we can conclude only that these are not good signs, at least they do not indicate maturity in line. We must continue to exert a good influence so that they go no further in such dangerous mistakes and correct these errors.

The Chinese comrades are taking an unprincipled stand towards the Rumanian line. In this direction there are ominous signs.

Chou En-lai said:

a) **«We (the Chinese) understand the Rumanian comrades, who want to take credits from the Americans, because otherwise they will be ruined».**

b) **«We understand the Rumanian comrades in their friendly relations with Tito, because they want to escape the Khrushchevite pressure and attack».**

At Bucharest, Li Hsien-nien developed the thesis that «we should make approaches to the Rumanians, because they are very determined in their opposition to Khrushchev and Khrushchev is the major devil, while Tito is a minor devil». This slogan has become very widespread

in recent times among the Chinese cadres, including their ambassador in Tirana.

In his talk with our comrades, Teng Hsiao-ping was much more explicit on this question. Apart from the above ideas, which he developed further and defended, he said openly:

a) **«The Rumanians listen neither to us, to you, nor to Tito».**

b) **«The Rumanians are resolute anti-Khrushchevites, therefore we (the Chinese) have decided to collaborate closely with them».**

c) **«We shall put aside the ideological questions with the Rumanians».**

There could be no clearer definition of an unprincipled line with the Rumanian centrists. This is very serious and must make us consider why it is occurring. Are these fortuitous, accidental, immature, not well-calculated stands, or traps set by the modern revisionists to lead the Chinese comrades into blind alleys? They could be all these things. Let us now try to draw some preliminary conclusions to see into the future more clearly.

The enemies of our enemies can be our true friends when they are on the same ideological and political line with us.

The enemies of our enemies can be temporary allies with us on certain questions, but we must not give way to them on principles and we must make this clear to them, must not conceal our line and principles from them.

The enemies of our enemies can be our enemies, and the two sides must remain and be fought as our enemies. The contradictions between these two sets of enemies are an incontestable law, they are inevitable contradictions, which our stern, continuous, consistent, principled fight deepens and makes more acute. We must take advantage of them, but must not soften and make concessions to one

or the other, or fall for their traps and their demagogy. I am afraid that the Chinese comrades are not always very clear about these matters.

In order to concentrate our forces on the struggle against modern revisionism, we must consider it the main enemy in the international communist movement, or to use the expression the Chinese prefer, **this is «the major devil», and this «major devil» must be fought by the Marxist-Leninists consistently, unwaveringly, to the end, in any form, at any time, and under any circumstances that it presents itself.** This «major devil», — to continue to use the Chinese figure — is comprised of many devils, some greater some smaller, some powerful some weak, some disguised some undisguised, some in the vanguard and some at the rear, some attack with cannons, some throw the stone and hide the hand, according to the situation and the circumstances. Sometimes these devils operate in isolation, sometimes they appear united, sometimes they split, because of the contradictions among themselves, in order to re-group in factions in which they are linked by their interests in the struggle against socialism, or they follow the groupings and contradictions of that bourgeoisie or imperialist power with which they are linked through the interests of their joint struggle against Marxism-Leninism, their main common enemy, or the struggle of some groupings against other bourgeois capitalist groupings with which the contradictions become acute.

In all this fierce and complicated struggle there is a range of tactics on the part of the Marxist-Leninists, and this range extends from efforts to save the deceived and the less contaminated, up to the merciless destruction of enemies. But any tactical stand of ours must be based on proletarian principles, and not on bourgeois principles and diplomacy.

When Khrushchev's traitor group had not yet come out openly, all of us, some earlier some later, some convinced and some less convinced, some in all seriousness and some dishonestly, said that the Titoite gang in Belgrade was the main revisionist enemy, and it was decided that it must be fought to the finish. For the reasons given above, Titoite revisionism was fought, but it was also underestimated by some who combated it only formally, while it worked both openly and under the lap. The fact is that it wrought havoc, inspired, guided and organized others to follow it. Meanwhile, in the Soviet Union, the Khrushchevite gang emerged with all its own features and its own tactics and strategy. This gang called the Titoites «fine fellows». Only the Party of Labour of Albania remained unrelenting. Khrushchev, too, became a «major devil», Tito was again given the title «devil», other «devils» emerged, and all these «devils», in solidarity, and organized, launched their powerful struggle against Marxism-Leninism on a world scale, against the Party of Labour of Albania, the Communist Party of China, and other parties which have taken a good stand.

However, the resolute principled struggle of our parties, and all the Marxist-Leninists in the world, who work actively, tore the disguise from the modern revisionists, regardless of whether they were minor or major devils. **Things reached the point that the revisionist leaders of many communist and workers' parties had to adopt revisionist positions openly and fight us actively. This must be considered a great victory achieved, a victory which must be carried further.** This caused many communist elements to break with the revisionist leaderships, many were expelled from parties dominated by the revisionists, and created new Marxist-Leninist parties, and this process is continuing. This must be considered another major victory, a victory which likewise must be carried further.

Our resolute struggle, the exposure of modern revisionists, the defeats which they have suffered and are suffering every day in all fields of national and international activity, have led to the outburst and deepening of the contradictions in the ranks of the modern revisionists. We must consider these contradictions, which are becoming deeper, great victories for revolutionary Marxism-Leninism in action.

Even in this situation our struggle against all revisionist groupings not only must not be toned down, but must be made more severe. Our tactic of concentrating our fire on the Titoite and Khrushchevite groupings was correct, because these two groupings were the pillars of modern revisionism. But this does not mean that we forgot to touch and combat the other revisionist groupings. In fact, we attacked and exposed them, too. Our state relations with some revisionist groupings that are in power did not hinder us from waging our ideological and political struggle against them.

Even now, the Titoite and Khrushchevite revisionist groupings remain the main ones, the pillars, but in this situation others are being set up around them and are operating more actively. These revisionist groupings, which are neither new nor unknown, are displaying more forcefully, what you might call, their «individuality» towards a revisionist policy of struggle against Marxism-Leninism as savage as ever, but with tendencies towards new groupings with new tactics.

We can say that the Titoite and the Khrushchevite revisionist groupings remain the leading ones, and the tendencies of two poles in the ranks of modern revisionism are appearing clearly: the Soviet pole and the Yugoslav-polycentrist Italian pole. (I've explained this si-

tuation in connection with Togliatti's «testament»)*. But the problem is that the Titoites are trying to strengthen the groupings under their direction, and their purpose in doing this is always to corrupt Marxism-Leninism, to discredit and fight socialism, to extinguish the revolution, and to extend the life of capitalism **(and these we must never forget)**; at the same time, they want to involve them in this struggle in order to speed up the process undertaken by them, and first of all, they are trying to speed up this process in the Soviet Union, by exerting pressure and blackmail on the Khrushchevite group to relinquish some of its authority, to give up the idea of «the leadership of world communism» by this group, to weaken the Soviet Union as a great economic and political power and make it a weak, bourgeois partner of American imperialism. In order to achieve this aim as quickly and easily as possible (and this is not so easy for the Titoites and the polycentrists, because the Khrushchevite group, too, is putting up a struggle and is trying to escape from this grip), the Titoites and their allies are even using our struggle to put pressure on Khrushchev, that is, they are threatening him also with the great danger from the Chinese. The Titoites and their present close allies are not pursuing a stupid policy but are varying it with more or less anti-Khrushchevite variants so that it can serve, at the same time, to catch fools in the net.

It is a fact that the contradictions among the revisionists are becoming more acute. But is it right to say, as the Chinese do, that **«Khrushchev is the major devil, we must concentrate our struggle against him; while Tito and the Rumanians and others like them are minor unimpor-**

* See: Enver Hoxha. «Speeches and Articles, 1963-1964», p. 270, Tirana, 1977, Eng. ed.

tant devils»? To speak like this is a mistake, indeed a serious mistake.

Khrushchev and Tito are in solidarity to the end in their strategic aims. They may have different tactics, they may have disagreements, and these will be even greater in the future, but these tactics will never be compatible with ours.

It would be a mistake to think and say that since **«the Titoites and their temporary allies have contradictions with Khrushchev, these contradictions assist Marxism-Leninism», and from this to go on to the mistaken idea that «the Titoites are unimportant devils», whereas with the Rumanians, who pose as anti-Khrushchevite, «we shall put aside ideological questions»,** which, in other words, means to support their centrist revisionist course, and to fail to fight their active and operating revisionist views.

Tito is just as dangerous as Khrushchev, if not more so, therefore, both must be fought with the greatest severity. Tito inspired Khrushchev, who now has entered a new phase. This new phase is: **Khrushchev has been exposed as a revisionist, has set out on the road of betrayal and will never turn back. Now Tito is facing the task: socialism must be completely destroyed in the Soviet Union, Khrushchev must go on following the baton of imperialists and be left without a feather to fly with in the process.**

In order to carry out this plan, Tito is grouping and consolidating his forces for the following objectives: to fight socialism, Marxism-Leninism, our countries and parties, the Soviet people and Soviet Marxist-Leninists. We must exploit the revisionist contradictions, because they speak of the weakness in their ranks, but it is a great mistake to underestimate the role of the Titoites in the ranks of the revisionists and to underrate their plan

which might look «lovely», because it appears to be against Khrushchev.

«Tito's struggle against Khrushchev» cannot be inspired by the same aims as those which guide our struggle against the Khrushchev group. Tito's struggle is the struggle of one traitor against another traitor for domination **and leadership; it is the struggle of two anti-Soviet traitor groupings against the peoples of the Soviet Union, and the Soviet Marxist-Leninists, of whom both these traitors are afraid.**

Our struggle, however, is inspired by the defence of Marxism-Leninism, as well as by the defence of the Soviet people and the victories of the Great October Revolution in the Soviet Union, by the stand of internationalist solidarity with the Soviet Marxist-Leninists in the struggle against modern revisionism.

Therefore, the aims of Tito's plan should not be underrated, but it would be an especially tragic mistake to proceed from the idea that in order to inflict «the maximum defeats» on the Khrushchev group we should deviate from our principled struggle against the latter, by falling into nationalist deviations, border claims, and other things of this sort which have nothing Marxist about them. Moreover, the modern revisionists are making such efforts to divert our principled struggle in order to provide weapons for the Khrushchevites, the Titoites and other groupings, and to make the Soviet people and the Soviet Marxists lose the perspective of their struggle so that they should not rise and organize resistance. Apart from this aim, the Titoite and other revisionist groups want to use these deviations to put even more pressure on Khrushchev to make concessions and submit to imperialism.

Therefore, the Chinese comrades ought to stop this course of «territorial claims» and raising «historical issues» immediately, because these lead to colossal mistakes

which are irreparable, or can be put right only with great losses.

Hence, **the Chinese pretention that the road of claims «does not help Khrushchev but fights him», is without foundation. The claim that Tito is the «minor devil» is also without foundation**, indeed it is based on a very wrong calculation on the part of the Chinese, a calculation which is not only mistaken but is to be condemned, because it can lead to very serious errors.

In this direction, the Rumanians' centrist revisionist stand has so enthused the Chinese that they are forgetting their ideological contradictions with them. **This is not a militant stand, it is not an alliance based on principle; this method of allegedly exploiting differences in the ranks of the revisionists is neither correct nor fruitful.** On this question, the Chinese comrades seem as if they do not want to know what are the real reasons which impel the Rumanians to oppose Khrushchev, but it is sufficient for them that the Rumanians are against Khrushchev for the moment, and proceeding from such an incomplete and unestablished premise, they are unreservedly supporting and extolling the views of the Rumanians en bloc. This is what Teng Hsiao-ping means when he says, «We will put aside the ideological questions with the Rumanians».

In order to strengthen some «good positions» of the Rumanians towards Khrushchev, should we put the ideological questions aside and not speak openly to the Rumanians about the dangers of their centrist revisionist line, not speak to them about the great danger of Titoism, of the great danger of their rapprochement with the American imperialists, and so on? These stands of the Chinese are wrong and astounding. The lack of consistency in the struggle to strengthen those who take a positive step cannot be covered with the words of Teng Hsiao-ping:

«The Rumanians listen neither to us, to you, nor to Tito».

The Rumanians may «not listen to anyone», as Teng Hsiao-ping says, but they listen to Tito all right, just as they listened to Khrushchev yesterday, when they attacked us. But in any case, should the question of whether or not the Rumanians listen to us stop us and make us keep quiet, refrain us from speaking our mind to the Rumanians, from telling them **what we think?** We are saying it tirelessly day and night and, contrary to what Teng Hsiao-ping says, **what we think** has had a direct and indirect influence on the first step of the Rumanians against the Khrushchevites? But what do the Chinese tell Dej? «We shall help you, just open your mouth and ask, Khrushchev wants to attack you, we shall defend you». These things are correct, but at the same time they imply: «It is your business that you rely on Tito, we understand why you are taking credits from the Americans, but just continue the struggle against Khrushchev and even demand Bessarabia, because it is your right, and we shall support you».

This tactic towards the Rumanians is not correct, because in their contradictions, bickerings and squabbles with the Khrushchevites, neither Tito, the Rumanians, nor the other revisionists, are inspired and led by the Marxist-Leninist principles which guide our struggle against the Khrushchevite gang. In their contradictions the revisionists are guided by the law of the jungle, by the capitalist contradictions of the moment. But this is not the case with us. But the Chinese may ask: Should we take advantage of these contradictions, of these opportunities presented to us? Of course we should. To do otherwise would be the greatest idiocy and we would not be worthy of the lofty title of the communist. But not in the way the Chinese are acting, because this course is a vicious circle which will spell nothing good for us.

Khrushchev is not an isolated person. Khrushchevism represents a powerful retrogressive current, a considerable part of modern revisionism in power. Therefore, it must be fought with all our strength, uncompromisingly, without hesitation. We must take advantage of every weakness, every defeat, and every difficulty of the Khrushchev group, which we and its other opponents create for it in ideology. We must take advantage of the defeats which the imperialists inflict on it. This is one thing. But while fighting the Khrushchev group we are not permitted to forget or underrate the role of other revisionists and weaken our vigilance and struggle against them.

Tito is not an isolated person, or an unimportant and «minor devil», as the Chinese say. Titoism is a powerful retrogressive current, a part of modern revisionism in power, which has behind it a colossal power, which directs and assists it, American imperialism. Apart from this, Khrushchevism rehabilitated it, strengthened it, has (though unwillingly) made it a powerful ideological and political partner which is now causing the Khrushchevites some problems. What sort of problems? **It is not only the Khrushchevites, but also the Titoites, who are dictating the law in the revisionist ranks.**

In these conditions, is it possible to underrate Titoism? That would be madness, **to say the least of it**, because to underrate Titoism, means to underrate the voice of American imperialism, which speaks through the mouth of Titoism in the ranks of international communism, means to underrate the sabotage, the undermining of the socialist camp by American imperialism through the direct action of its effective agency bought with dollars, Titoism. To underrate Titoism is betrayal, deviation from the principled struggle, and weakening of our struggle. That we should underrate and ignore Titoism, while it goes on with its work, this is what Titoism wants. Tito also wants us

to direct all our attention to Khrushchev, because this interests him for the tactical aims of imperialism which he serves. **Therefore Titoism must be fought with all our strength, without compromise or hesitation.**

Tito is linked with the Rumanians in order to win them over to his side so that they do not come over to us. He wants to turn the Rumanians from Khrushchevite reserves into his own reserves. This is a simple calculation. Meanwhile, instead of fighting for the Rumanians to turn to the correct course and become fighters for Marxism-Leninism, the Chinese comrades say «there is nothing we can do about it», «we understand why the Rumanians are linked with Tito and the Americans». Astonishing! This is very astonishing!

But, to continue this reasoning of the Chinese, let us suppose that tomorrow the Polish revisionists adopt more or less the same stand as the Rumanians — quarrel with Khrushchev, link themselves even more with the Americans, etc., link themselves strongly with Titoism and the revisionist groups with which they are in accord, and make certain declarations (in which they are greatly interested), such as: «we want friendship» with the People's Republic of China, «we are not engaging in polemics», and other such nonsense, and continue their work. Then the Chinese, according to their own logic, will act as they are doing with the Rumanians and say: «We will put the ideological questions aside with the Poles, too». And so on in turn. **(The Rumanian-Chinese experience is the test-bench.)** As a consequence, the polemic which we say «does not stop», is gradually ended. But if it is ended with all these, «why should it not be ended with the Krushchevites, too»? The compromise can easily be found, the forms, reasons, circumstances etc. are found, and «conciliation», «fraternization» and «unity» is achieved. **Who**

benefits from such a course? Modern revisionism. What is betrayed on this course? Marxism-Leninism.

In no way can we take this course of betrayal and it is our duty to fight so that the Chinese comrades abandon this dangerous course on which they have started out. We cannot make any concession on this question, we must not waver at all. This does not mean that we have to use «harsh» forms, but principles are principles, and we shall defend them at any cost and sacrifice.

The Chinese comrades are treating the Rumanian question very frivolously and incautiously. The Rumanians are playing their allegedly «independent», «pro-Chinese», «anti-Khrushchevite», «principled», centrist role as «heroic and valiant», «wise and fearless politicians», very skilfully. The Rumanian revisionist leaders are also playing the role of the «match-maker», who carries the proposals from one to the other allegedly with «the best of intentions», proving very «intimate with the Chinese», even holding secret conspiratorial meetings with them and behaving like one of the family.

All these dubious activities of the Rumanians, who have never had a stable character in their affairs and traditions, become dangerous if they are not put to the test, in the «vice» of Marxist-Leninist vigilance, by the Chinese comrades.

Why do we have and must we have doubts about the Rumanians? The reason is clear. If they are on the right Marxist-Leninist course, why do they not dare approach us? **Because we tell them the truth?** Then we are right to doubt them.

Or, are they afraid of someone? Then they are not Marxists, and we are right to doubt them.

Or because we are «small»? Then they are not Marxists and we are right to doubt them.

Or, finally, because they are afraid that we are expos-

ing their game and their aims? Then we are right to doubt them, and we do well to doubt them, so long as they give no further proofs. The breeze can take their words, their deeds remain.

The Rumanians pose as «great heroes» because they are not going to the meeting. (We value the Rumanians' act in itself, it is good, against Khrushchev.) But they have declared that they are ready to go, if the Chinese go. Hence, to a certain degree, they are in accord with Khrushchev's aims (because for Khrushchev the meeting would be a success for his aims if we were to go).

We want the Khrushchevites and the other revisionists to hold the meeting. But if you were to ask me, «Are you convinced that the Chinese, too, want the revisionists to hold the meeting?» I would answer that I could not swear to it.

It will please the Rumanians greatly if the meeting is not held. On this problem there are now other revisionists who might put pressure on Khrushchev to postpone it. Khrushchev wants just one word, one promise from the Chinese, and he will leave the meeting for later, until he can patch up his leaking «ship». If the modern revisionists postpone the meeting and launch a satellite carrying three men into the outer space in order to save their reputation, then the Rumanians will win and their mediation as go-betweens will have yielded its fruit, the match-maker will continue to work to mend the broken bowls and fill them with sherbet for the «marriage» of the communists with the revisionists.

But all the traitors of every hue and under any disguise will suffer disgraceful defeat. There will never be a «marriage» between communists and revisionist traitors. On the contrary, the struggle will go on until the total defeat of modern revisionism and the complete victory of Marxism-Leninism.

TUESDAY
OCTOBER 13, 1964

THE CHINESE HAVE BEGUN A CAMPAIGN OF APPROACHES TO THE REVISIONISTS OF EUROPE WHO ARE IN POWER

In reply to the question of the comrades of our Party and Government delegation, «We trust that you will give us your answer to our letter in connection with the borders of the Soviet Union», Comrade Mao said: «The future will prove whether we are right or wrong. We are not going to reply to you, because, if we did, we would reject your views as you rejected ours, and thus polemics would arise. Therefore, let us wait, perhaps, after many years we shall reply to you, but not now»*.

This reply is not right, it is an unprincipled, incorrect, slighting and not at all comradely stand towards the Central Committee of the Party of Labour of Albania. On the other hand, this reply shows that Comrade Mao does not like comradely criticism, therefore we must come to some conclusions:

The Chinese comrades not only reconfirm that Comrade Mao said what the Japanese socialists declared, but are maintaining their former positions towards us on these problems, and consider these positions correct. On the

---

* From the minutes of the talk with the Albanian Party and Government delegation, October 9, 1964, Central Archives of the Party.

other hand, the fact is that their stands on these problems are not as resolute as they appear to be when they are confronted with our criticisms. The Chinese ambassadors in the various countries of Europe have received instructions on what stand to take towards this problem.

The Chinese ambassador in Poland seeks a meeting with Gomulka (undoubtedly to explain Mao's interview with the Japanese socialists), Gomulka refuses to receive him and recommends a meeting with a member of the Political Bureau. The Chinese ambassador goes to the meeting, and the Pole not only receives him coldly, but rejects what Mao said, and demands that the Chinese-make statements recognizing the Oder-Neisse borders. The Chinese ambassador tries to excuse Mao, agrees to make a statement, and makes it over Radio Warsaw on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China. Meanwhile, the question of **«Polish territories seized by the Soviet Union» remains «as it was» (as Mao has said). This interests the Polish nationalists and at the same time, also serves the Chinese in their struggle against Khrushchev and in their approaches to the Poles.** «Clever», «nationalist» tactic on the part of the Chinese!! And «in order to correct» this situation, this pearl of Mao's, the Chinese are stepping up their flattery of the Poles on the pretext that «the Poles have contradictions with Khrushchev and we should take advantage of these contradictions».

Why are these contradictions of the Soviets with the Poles emerging now?!! And what sort of contradictions are they? Don't the Chinese comrades know the nature of these contradictions? Of course they do, and precisely for this reason they are urging the Poles on the nationalist road. This means, on the one hand, to pursue those ways and tactics which imperialism uses to play the peoples and states off against one another, and on the

other hand, to attempt to describe these as «socialist tactics». No, these actions are not correct, they are not Marxist.

In order to cover up this mistake of Comrade Mao, the Chinese comrades have started a rumour that allegedly «he was only talking about history». But since he is talking about «history», then why did he not take these questions right through to the end? In speaking of «history» you cannot restrict yourself to speaking only about the Soviet Union, unless you have definite aims. And what might these definite aims be? They could be: to attack and discredit Stalin calling him a plunderer and an imperialist, as well as the Soviet Union when he led it, and to incite the anti-Marxist chauvinist sentiments of those revisionists who have contradictions with the revisionist Khrushchev.

Since Mao spoke about «history», why did he not speak about Transylvania, too, which «is Hungarian territory», but spoke only about Bessarabia and Moldavia which «are Rumanian territories»? Since Mao has come out to decide the borders of other countries for «history», why did he not speak also about Kosova, and so on?

No, the Chinese comrades themselves can see that this excuse does not hold water and is like a black coat sown with white thread. On the one hand they «speak about history», but on the other hand, they defend the thesis that, «no established border must be shifted». Then the question arises: When you present these questions correctly historically, and say that the borders must not be shifted, then why raise these problems at these moments? Who does this serve? Mao told our comrades, «We are firing our artillery with blank charges», which means, «only to make a noise». A fine noise!!

Mao also said that no one is listening to Khrushchev's «noise» about «the noise which Mao is making». That is to say, they listen to Mao, and no one believes Khrush-

chev, or in other words: The Soviets allegedly listen to, understand, and applaud Mao when he tells them: «Return the Polish, Rumanian, Czech, Chinese, Japanese and other territories», while, when Khrushchev tells the Soviets that Mao wants to destroy the Soviet Union, the Soviets allegedly not only do not listen to him, but hate him, because he does not return these territories! Astonishing logic!

The Rumanian leadership has begun to praise Mao within Rumania, to describe him as a great ideologist and politician, who not only attacks Khrushchev, but also criticizes Stalin. It says that Mao «spoke very correctly about Bessarabia, which the Soviets have seized from us, but we are not raising this question for the time being, because we are concerned about Transylvania».

The Rumanians are «in the vanguard» in publicizing the Chinese, their «maturity» and our «stubbornness». We heard from reliable sources that the Rumanians had planned to bring us together with the Soviets, as well as the Chinese with the Soviets, at their national celebration. However, they failed with us, because «the Albanians are stubborn and sectarian», while, according to the Rumanians, Mikoyan «showed himself to be reasonable and a good diplomat with the Chinese».

The Chinese comrades, for their part, have begun a campaign of approaches to the revisionists of Europe who are in power (with the exception of the Soviets). From the negative position they wanted to adopt on the occasion of the 15th anniversary of China's National Day, of not inviting not only the revisionists but also us, now they are going to the revisionists' celebrations, speaking blandly, with enthusiasm and ardour, about the «friendship of the peoples» etc. They tell us: «We must work well among them, because we shall benefit from the contradictions which they have with Khrushchev». However, such is the Chinese enthusiasm that «it may wipe out the contradic-

tions» which the Chinese themselves have with these revisionists, in favour of the latter, or of an unprincipled compromise. This whole business indicates something unhealthy, non-Marxist.

If the Chinese have a «plan for an offensive» in Europe, a «new and original tactic» to benefit from the inter-revisionist contradictions and «to fight Khrushchev», they should have put it forward and discussed it together with us and the others. This they did not do and have no intention of doing. They are acting on their own, and all they are saying is only words.

In practice the Chinese comrades put the matter in this way: **«We are acting; you may follow us or not, as you see fit, we shall not get into polemics with you; let us leave history to judge those things on which we are not in agreement». This is not correct, this is not Marxist. History is written every day.**

Every action, good or bad, of our parties is recorded, linked with former and subsequent actions, and when the actions are not well-considered, they have bad consequences. **We think that ill-considered actions must be avoided, and that there can be such actions both from us and from them, not only from the small parties but also from the big parties. Therefore consultations are necessary. The fact is that the Chinese comrades are avoiding bilateral consultations with us, as well as multilateral consultations.**

It has always been our side which has sought exchanges of opinions on different problems with the Chinese comrades. We have always taken the initiative. They have not put forward problems from their side, but have discussed the problems which we have raised.

We shall continue this correct Marxist method of work, we shall always tell the Chinese comrades of our views, even if this is hard for us and unpleasant for

them. And we shall demand from them that discussions must be held about our views and not «avoided» from fear that «we shall get into polemics in this way». We are not afraid to discuss before engaging in polemics, and we have no reason to get into polemics when we have the possibility to discuss like Marxists and to convince each other with arguments and facts.

We must leave nothing «for history to resolve». We must solve those things which are up to us, and solve them correctly, while history can give its judgement later about the solutions which our parties give them.

We shall continue to collaborate and struggle in close co-operation, on the Marxist-Leninist course. We are confident that we shall clear up these matters and put them right, in the great interest of the Party and of strengthening our doctrine, Marxism-Leninism, which is under attack by the modern revisionists of every shade and by world imperialism.

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 15, 1964

THE CHINESE IDEA ABOUT AN ANTI-IMPERIALIST FRONT INCLUDING EVEN THE MODERN REVISIONISTS IS ANTI-LENINIST

The Chinese comrades, Liu Shao-chi, in particular, if I am not mistaken, in a talk with a delegation of ours which had gone to Peking, launched the idea that in order to fight imperialism, and especially American imperialism, **we must work to create a broad anti-imperialist front, including even the modern revisionists.** Chou En-lai also mentioned such an idea in passing, when he was here nearly a year ago. **We opposed his idea of collaborating with the modern revisionists for such a thing, but with the creation of an anti-imperialist front we are in agreement, naturally, and we are working for this.** However, Chou En-lai did not retract or develop this idea, but left it in silence. He cast the stone and let it lie.

This very important matter was raised at certain particular moments which seem quite inappropriate. This idea was thrown in when our ideological and political struggle with the modern revisionists had become extremely acute, and especially when the Khrushchev group was up to its neck in serious, concrete collaboration with the American imperialists. Without any hesitation, it was putting into practice its whole anti-Leninist policy of Khrushchevite «coexistence», making concessions to the American aggressive

policy, prettifying American imperialism, weakening the peoples' liberation struggle and activizing and sharpening the struggle against Marxism-Leninism, against the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania.

When the group of Nikita Khrushchev, at the head of the modern revisionists, was weakening the struggle against imperialism, the Chinese comrades launched the idea of the creation of an anti-imperialist front including even the modern revisionists. Astonishing!!

However, we did not see any concrete action in this direction on the part of the Chinese comrades, with the exception of the fact that their propaganda against the Khrushchevites was not developed at the necessary rate that the moments demanded, although signs of softening in their anti-Khrushchevite polemic did not appear. We thought that this idea launched by the Chinese was not well-considered, like many of their ideas which later, with the passage of time, they return to and think over again. However, for a long time no more was said on this question.

But three or four days ago this idea of the Chinese came out openly, publicly, in the leading article of the organ of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, **which, while condemning the meeting proposed by Khrushchev for next December, proposed a meeting of 81 communist and workers' parties to discuss and decide on the creation of an «anti-imperialist front».**

As it appears, the Chinese have worked out their idea with the communist parties of Asia and have come to the conclusion that this idea should be made public and discussed among world opinion and international communist opinion. If a «son» is born then its father becomes recognized, if nothing results then there still remains «the good»,

«kind intention», because the front had the word «anti-imperialist» in its title.

This is no minor matter, but one of the most important. **This is the laying of a revisionist turn of policy and ideology on the table for discussion, regardless of the fact that this has been dressed up as an «anti-imperialist front».**

We must look a little deeper into what is hidden behind this ideological-political action of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Japan, and who benefits from this «new line» which is emerging in international policy and the international communist movement.

In broad outline, what is the objective of our policy and actions in the international arena? The struggle against world imperialism, against colonialism, old and new, in whatever form it appears, the struggle for the consolidation of socialism and the spreading of it throughout the world, unceasing aid, with all our means, for the peoples' national liberation struggles to break the chains of imperialist, capitalist and colonialist slavery, the provision of all-round aid to new states to consolidate the independence won, to consolidate the people's democratic state power, and to raise their economic and cultural level. Our struggle in the international arena consists of effective disarmament of the imperialists, who are preparing a nuclear war, preparing new chains for the peoples, preparing a new catastrophe for them.

To fight for our triumph in these fields implies that we must defend world peace, or more precisely, must struggle to establish world peace. The imperialists, their military and economic strength and their ideology are hindering this world peace. We must fight and destroy them through repeated battles **on a world anti-imperialist front.**

The world anti-imperialist front is based, naturally, on the building of some alliances by our side against im-

perialism, on the defining of certain stands on our part with objectives, more or less remote from one another, according to the targets which we attack and the progressive or backward political potential of the forces running these targets, etc. But in all this labyrinth of alliances and stands we must not for one moment make concessions over principle, and at no time should our actions be fortuitous, arising from hasty judgements and based on passing circumstances.

On the other hand, none of us should proceed from the idea that «since I have prestige, authority and strength, I judge more correctly, I am in a position to judge more correctly, and the others must support me, follow me, and contribute themselves, in their own spheres where they have the possibility, but always following me». Such a thing is neither correct nor fruitful. In such important actions, at the start of each new common action, with an international, general character, we must always be guided by the Marxist-Leninist principles and Marxist-Leninist analysis of the situation. And for this to be done properly, it is not sufficient simply to «launch the idea» and let whoever wants to follow you, but you must throw in the idea and discuss it long and thoroughly with the comrades. The way the Chinese and Japanese comrades are operating is not correct and is unacceptable.

To launch the idea of an «anti-imperialist front including even the modern revisionists» is politically and ideologically inconceivable, bearing in mind the stage the situation has now reached. If you base this «idea» on the «experience of the past», and deliberately overlook the result, or better, the fact that this «experience of the past» suffered defeat when social-democracy voted for the war budgets in the First Imperialist War and was transformed into a social-chauvinist means «for the defence of the Homeland», then this is open betrayal. The open betrayal

by social-democrats, social-chauvinists, brought about as a logical consequence the split with the Marxist-Leninists, brought about the creation of the revolutionary 3rd International, which opposed the traitor 2nd International.

Now the idea is launched of the «anti-imperialist front even with the modern revisionists». But what is the policy and ideology of this modern revisionism, with which we are supposed to unite to create this anti-imperialist front? A policy and an ideology precisely the opposite of our Marxist-Leninist ideology, a policy and ideology which are actively in struggle to sabotage the fundamental issues of our struggle against imperialism and colonialism, for the triumph of socialism and Marxism-Leninism, for the real solution to the problems of general and total disarmament, etc., etc.

Since we are in fierce and open struggle with modern revisionism on these main questions of principle and practice, how can we conceive an alliance or a political and ideological front against imperialism and the world bourgeoisie with the agency of the bourgeoisie and its ideology?! The anti-imperialist front means a political front, first of all. The question arises: Is it possible for us Marxist-Leninists to create a common front with the modern revisionists? Apparently, to the Chinese and Japanese it is possible. To us no, this can never be! But is it possible for the Marxist-Leninists to form a «political» front with the modern revisionists against American imperialism, while continuing the «ideological struggle» with them, or by «putting aside the questions which divide us ideologically», as the Japanese comrades say? We say: No, in no way!

For the Marxist-Leninists there is no policy without ideology. With Egypt, with Mali, with Burundi, and with many other national states, an anti-imperialist front can be formed. Here there is policy, but there is also ideology.

However, even in this case, we make no concessions or deals over principles with them. They know our principles, because we do not conceal them. On the contrary, it is those principles which constitute our strength and the success of this alliance, from which a number of bourgeois national states want to benefit in their struggle against imperialism. This is of interest to us, because in this way we weaken imperialism, and this is of interest to them, too, because by weakening imperialism they strengthen themselves. However, the struggle against imperialism automatically strengthens the revolutionary popular forces, first of all, hence, the revolution, socialism, reap all-round victories. At the same time, amongst the bourgeois national states which are fighting on this anti-imperialist front, too, a differentiation will take place, the class struggle and the revolution will develop, here more quickly there more slowly, but nevertheless always with struggle and efforts.

But the modern revisionists, Khrushchev, Tito, etc., with whom we are asked to form such «alliances» and «fronts» as those proposed, what are they fighting for? Are they fighting for socialism, for the revolution, for Marxism-Leninism? You have to be a revisionist to say yes. **Marxists say that the revisionists are and always will be anti-revolutionaries, anti-Marxists,** that they are fighting against socialism and communism, fighting to extend the existence of capitalism. Then, **to form an «anti-imperialist front with the modern revisionists», means that the Marxist-Leninists must turn into Don Quixotes and wage a «stern struggle against windmills», that is, wage a struggle against the «imperialist wind», a «struggle» against imperialism, which has no Marxist-Leninist flavour either politically or ideologically.** Only the modern revisionists wage a Quixotic struggle against imperialism. If you have a mind to wage such a struggle then, of course,

«the anti-imperialist front with the modern revisionists» is possible and realizable. This is the ideal of the Washington chiefs, Tito, Khrushchev, the modern revisionists, social-democracy, and so on. If you have this idea, that means you are no longer a Marxist, but a revisionist. The Marxist-Leninists cannot take this course of betrayal, and must fight such an idea, which is utterly revisionist and treacherous from start to finish.

The revisionist traitors, Khrushchev, Tito and company dream of an idea, a «stroke of genius». This idea gets them out of their difficulties, pulls them from the grave, which we Marxists have dug for them, and it is the Chinese and Japanese comrades who are holding out their hand to pull them from this grave!

Khrushchev wants to hold the meeting of the 81 parties and expel us. In acting in this way he is committing suicide. This is precisely what we want and are fighting for: to bury modern revisionism. We are acting correctly in refusing to go to their meeting and we want the meeting to be held without us. The Chinese and the Japanese are opposed to Khrushchev's meeting, but their desire is that the meeting which they themselves proposed should not be held without our participation. For the meeting to be held without us is a defeat for modern revisionism. As usual, Khrushchev has got into a trap, into an adventure. His revisionist associates held back, opposed the meeting, some vociferously some in a low voice, but all of them in order to save modern revisionism from this predicament. The revisionists are able to do many things to extend their existence. Hence, Khrushchev's meeting was compromised, reached an impasse. And instead of working to deepen the crisis in which modern revisionism is wallowing, to exploit this success, the Japanese comrades, with their proposal of a «new 81 parties' meeting with the aim of creating an anti-imperialist front»

did the modern revisionists the favour of holding out a branch to pull them from the grave. This is an «olive branch», a typical example of a completely anti-Marxist act.

What does the proposal of the Japanese comrades mean in practice? «You, Soviet comrades, give up the idea of the meeting which you have raised, allegedly to iron out the ideological differences and bring unity to the ranks of the international communist movement. Preparations are needed (until the printing of the 10 articles of the Communist Party of China, this famous series, is complete!). Let us prepare another meeting, which we propose for the creation of an 'anti-imperialist front'. This is very interesting, very much needed today and urgent. It is 'acceptable' to all parties. Let us put aside what divides us, and look at what 'unites us'. (And this is what you Nikita Khrushchev have said and want.) At this meeting we should not speak about our differences, but only about the 'anti-imperialist front' (which you are in favour of and talk about, too, Nikita).

«Hence we are to go to the meeting and grind away like a mill without grain, make a noise and come out in struggle against windmills. (We think that you Nikita have no opposition to the roar of artillery with blank charges). But we shall come out of the meeting with something 'important', with a 'steel unity' against imperialism. This is a colossal success on a colossal issue. (This automatically, dear Nikita, softens the polemic and smooths over the other disagreements.)» This is What the Japanese want to say with their «brilliant» proposal about a new meeting.

And Nikita Khrushchev, if he is not entirely an ass, will say to the dear Japanese comrades: «But where have you been up to now? We want this, too, this has been my aim, to cease the polemic (after all, let the Chinese fire

their last shot*), and let us kiss and make up, bring out a statement, even with a bit more bite than the Moscow Statement had, and put an end to this difficult situation that has been created for us. As to how things will go after the meeting, that is up to you, or are you going to accuse me again of violating the second statement as I did the first? In that case, I shall reply that you are slandering me, that you have violated the second statement and not I».

In other words, the «Chinese idea», concretized by the Japanese in the proposal for a «new meeting of communist and workers' parties of the world», is a revisionist deviation from the Marxist-Leninist positions of the struggle against modern revisionism, a revisionist compromise with the anti-Marxists. We must reject, oppose and fight this because it will have evil and dangerous consequences for Marxism-Leninism, socialism and communism. We must be vigilant towards the ways and methods which the Chinese and Japanese comrades will employ to develop this «brilliant idea». Are they going to consult us? In principle this should be done. If they act in this way, we shall tell them of our opinion. If they do not act in this way we shall still tell them of our opinion. If they act publicly, without seeking our opinion, or while refusing to discuss our opinion, then we shall be obliged to make our stand on this problem known publicly, too.

* Refers to the tenth article of the CP of China against modern revisionism which was never published.

SATURDAY
OCTOBER 31, 1964

IN NO WAY CAN WE RECONCILE OURSELVES TO THESE VIEWS OF CHOU EN-LAI

Yesterday Comrade Nesti Nase communicated to us what Chou En-lai, on behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, told a group of ambassadors for the central committees of their respective parties. The same day, all the comrades of our leadership were informed of the exact content of Chou En-lai's statement. He pointed out to the ambassadors that what he was telling them, he had also previously told Chervonenko, the Soviet Ambassador in Peking.

The views expressed by Chou En-lai are entirely unacceptable to our Party, both in essence and in form, because they are profoundly opportunist, capitulationist towards the Khrushchevite revisionists, frought with aims dangerous to Marxism-Leninism and the further struggle against modern revisionism, and are utterly provocative towards our Party.

Chou En-lai's views, expressed in the name of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, about the fall of Khrushchev, about the people who replaced him, about their aims and future policy, about the unity of the world communist movement, about the unity of the socialist camp, and about the method and the line which we must follow in the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism, in all the key directions of this new

situation which has been created, in my opinion, are very unclear, vacillating, conciliatory and opportunist from start to finish (not to use stronger terms for the time being). These opinions indicate a capitulation to modern revisionism. **We cannot reconcile ourselves in any way to these views of Chou En-lai, because they are revisionist from start to finish, anti-Marxist, capitulationist, and lead to the road of betrayal of Marxism-Leninism.**

In presenting such views, the Chinese comrades are making very grave mistakes, and are and will be bringing colossal harm to communism.

The views which Chou En-lai expressed and the manner in which he expressed them to the ambassadors are full of anti-Marxist «great state» and «big party» sentiments, which must be condemned, with the feeling of scorn and disregard for the personality of a Marxist-Leninist party, which, according to the activity and judgement of Chou En-lai, does not need to be convinced after serious Marxist-Leninist discussion, but must be driven with a stick, according to the «conductor's baton», a term fabricated by them appropriately against Krushchev, which it is quite obvious that they themselves are now using against our Party. There is no trace of Marxist honesty, or political maturity, let alone ideological maturity, about the hidden aims of the actions which the Chinese have in mind.

Such an immature, vacillating stand of the Chinese, with frequent, marked and astonishing oscillations, sometimes to the left and sometimes to the right, comes as no surprise to us. We have encountered such a stand on their part during our common struggle, especially against the Khrushchevite, Titoite and other modern revisionists, although we cannot say we have observed such a thing in regard to their stands on principle and in practice against imperialism, and especially against American imperialism.

What they will do later is another matter. Let us hope they don't have oscillations and let us make our contribution to this end.

From all these observations we can reach a conclusion (and this declaration of Chou En-lai's further confirms our opinion) that **the Chinese comrades did not want to go so far in the struggle against the modern revisionists, and had not envisaged such an extension of the struggle against them, such bitterness with them.** This comes about because they had probably not thought out and understood the danger of modern revisionism, its ferocity, in all its real extent, and therefore were not spiritually armed for such a struggle. The Chinese had thought that matters would not become so acute with the modern revisionists, nurturing the idea that the modern revisionists would prove reasonable, that the article entitled «Long Live Leninism!» and some internal articles and debates would suffice «to convince» Khrushchev and his associates to return to the line which the Chinese would show them. However, this did not and could not occur. Our Party foresaw such a thing correctly. It was prepared from every standpoint for a resolute struggle to the end against modern revisionism. Thus the Chinese comrades found themselves on the defensive and not on the offensive. They began and continued on the defensive, while the revisionists attacked us openly and we, likewise, attacked them openly.

The stand of the Chinese, even after the public attack of the Soviet revisionists on us, was that «the open polemic must be stopped». Later this polemic went too far and could no longer be stopped. But during this struggle, hesitation, temporary halts in the polemics, were apparent among the Chinese comrades.

From the assessment which the Chinese make of the struggle against revisionism in this situation, and from the way Chou En-lai expressed himself to the ambassadors,

it is clear that they are tired of this struggle, which was a heavy burden for them, that they want to pull out, and that is why they judged the downfall of Khrushchev as the most appropriate moment for them to retire «with honour». And in the most anti-Marxist, unfriendly, uncomradely way (formally, at least, they ought to preserve the forms of friendship with the ally with whom they have fought shoulder to shoulder), the Chinese comrades took their own decisions (and what sort of decisions!!) and tried in the most brutal way to impose an impermissible meeting on us, too.

How did the Chinese comrades judge the new situation? In the most deplorable way. They have not thought with their heads, but with their feet, if we are still of the opinion that they are Marxists. But, however they have thought, with their heads, their hearts or their feet, this is revisionist thinking to achieve revisionist results.

In short, **for them the fall of Khrushchev is everything. According to them, the major thing has been achieved, and now it is only a matter of time for everything to be put right.** The Chinese comrades say: **We must hold out our hand to the «Soviet comrades», the associates of Khrushchev, must forget the past, it's over and done with, we must be understanding with the «Soviet comrades». Hence, according to them, we must assist these fine Soviet comrades. Khrushchev died, Khrushchevism died. There is no one left who must acknowledge the mistakes made, there is no one who ought to make self-criticism. Of course, the «dear Soviet comrades» made the self-criticism they had to make with the bringing down of Khrushchev. Now,** continue the Chinese comrades through the mouth of Chou En-lai, indeed before all the ambassadors, **nothing remains but to pack our bags quickly, because time does not wait, and set off for Moscow, to kiss one another on the day of the celebration of the Great October Socialist**

Revolution. And the gesture is solemn and theatrical (because Chou En-lai also speaks about the theatre which they made of their National Day, the 1st of October), but then the celebration is a solemn day as well. Hence, we are to go to Moscow, as the revolutionaries we are, and steel our unity together with the «great revolutionaries» that we find there. What a comedy!!

As if this were not enough, Chou En-lai rose to his feet, and in front of all the other ambassadors, said to our ambassador: **«I know that you don't have even diplomatic relations with the Soviets because they broke them off. But now there is no one to make self-criticism because Krushchev has been removed; therefore, Mehmet Shehu should pack his bag quickly and set off for the celebrations in Moscow». And he added further: «When I leave you, Chervonenko will come to a meeting with me and I shall tell him that the Supreme Soviet should invite the 12 socialist countries to the celebration»! What infamy!!** He did not forget to say to the ambassadors also, and this certainly addressed to the Rumanians (as they told me, they had reached agreement with the Rumanians earlier), **«If one of you has any special proposal, I could make it directly to the Soviets». In other words, «you may propose that the Yugoslavs should be invited to the celebration, and we have no objection to this, indeed, between ourselves, this would please us». What treachery!!**

This whole decision, this whole idea, this whole way of raising this question of such importance for the future of communism, has nothing Marxist about it, is anti-Marxist, opportunist, revisionist treachery in its entirety. This is absolutely identical with the action of Khrushchev when he went to Belgrade for the first time to embrace Tito, to beg his pardon for the «crimes of Stalin» against him and to rehabilitate this traitor.

Such a thing proves all that I have said above about

how the Chinese conducted the polemic and how they understood the struggle against revisionism, but at the same time this proves that they are idealists, fatalists, and see the question of the struggle against modern revisionism from the angle of the «struggle against the individual», from the individualist angle, not the principled angle, see it from the chauvinist position of domination, prestige, etc. How undignified they show themselves towards the class enemy, the enemies of the revolution, the enemies of our ideology!

On the other hand, and apart from what I said above, from this scandalous performance of Chou En-lai's, we must draw other logical conclusions which, regrettably, confirm their betrayal.

What are they?

1 — To assemble the ambassador of Rumania, and finally, even the ambassador of Cuba, together with us, means to say to them: «You, Rumanian comrades (who up till yesterday were on the road of betrayal), and you, Cuban comrades (although you never failed to pour all those praises on Khrushchev), fully deserve the honour of being called those who brought down Khrushchev. We, the popes of Peking, consider you as such. Amen!».

2 — «As to you Albanians, we do not even ask your opinion about these situations, or what you think about the proposals we are making. **You must do as we say immediately. Put aside any claim you have on the 'Soviet comrades', it doesn't matter that the 'Soviet comrades' have done all these things to you for five years on end, up to the point that they called you spies of imperialism and broke off relations with your state, but you should bow your heads and hurry to Canossa!»** What a dirty feudal, fascist mentality! No bourgeois could speak in such a way. Even bourgeois dignity and standards do not permit such disgraceful arrogance. As is known, we immediately slapped back our reply, scorching their faces like a branding iron.

3 — All this was a provocation against us, and on the other hand, it was a scene prepared to tell the Soviets, the Rumanians, the Cubans and others of this ilk: «From now on, I am breaking with the Albanians, I am no longer in solidarity with them, on either the political or the ideological issues. From now on, the Albanians are acting on their own, and they must bear the responsibility for everything they do!!» This is evident, because the Chinese comrades knew very well that we would not proceed on this road of betrayal, as they are doing, that we would reply to them, therefore they gave their reply on this issue to the Soviets and others in advance.

4 — From the haste with which they acted in connection with this so important a question, without previously consulting us (and this demand of ours is lawful), and without waiting at least for our reply, we are obliged to think that they created a fait accompli, because they might have been afraid lest some part of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, impelled by our reply, would react and, consequently, this treacherous action would be stopped.

5 — Regardless of the servility, the lack of dignity which they display in begging the Soviet revisionists to invite them to the celebration of the October Socialist Revolution or to meetings (as the Soviet renegades please), their begging to go to the celebration of the revolution in Moscow, conceals in itself a base hankering after «fame». Their intention is to go to Moscow and say to the **world**, say to the Soviets: «See, we have come as the cosmonauts of Peking, as the victors who brought down Khrushchev, **we are the 'brilliant', 'infallible brain'** of the communist movement. **All have been brought down, all were wrong — Stalin, Khrushchev and the others. Mao, alone, saw and sees things correctly. Hence, now it is completely right to say: Marx, Engels, Lenin, Mao!».**

However, if the Soviet revisionists, who are always amongst the worst revisionists, are intelligent, they will hardly fall for this clumsy trap of Chou En-la's (unless they consider they will gain more than they lose from this). It is possible that they will not act as Chou En-lai wishes. They may invite him, or someone else, later, not as the «victor», but as the «vanquished» to Canossa.

Briefly, this is the situation, a grave situation, very dangerous and harmful to the international communist movement. The Communist Party of China has a colossal weight in the international communist movement. This weight has been increased by its stand against modern revisionism, but many of its waverings and mistakes, which we know, the others do not know yet. The weight of China in the international arena and its role in the world is great. Whether or not the Communist Party of China is on a correct resolute Marxist-Leninist line, means whether the revolution will advance or will be slowed down, delayed and damaged. But in the end, whatever occurs, the revolution, Marxism-Leninism will triumph.

The course on which the Chinese comrades want to set out and are setting out, is very dangerous, very harmful. Chou En-lai declared: «The polemics ceased on the 16th of October, we declared an armistice. We shall have some contradictions and the polemic might flare up again, but again it will die down», and so on. This is precisely the tactic of the revisionists towards their comrade Tito. This is just how they acted with Tito: kisses, while not forgetting to say, «we have some contradictions», sometimes they engaged in polemics with the Titoites (but always reluctantly, because if they had failed to do so they would have been exposed more rapidly), and then kisses and more kisses, but not only that. During this period Tito was inspiring them, one might say, in policy,

in ideology, in organization, and degeneration. And in the end, even the famous «contradictions» disappeared from their vocabulary and unity was achieved.

Chou En-lai's «theory» is a forewarning of the same tactics and actions. We must be very, very vigilant, and continue to struggle resolutely. We shall encounter many difficulties, they will isolate us, but with struggle we shall break out of the encirclement, because Marxism-Leninism cannot be isolated or suppressed. We are Marxists, the Party of Labour of Albania is a glorious Marxist-Leninist Party, therefore we shall break out of any encirclement, any isolation. It will tell the truth with force, and the Marxists everywhere in the world will hear it. Justice will triumph.

In no way will we accept the revisionist views and actions of the Chinese. On the contrary, we mast expose and fight them. The bridges connecting us with them are collapsing, but we shall strive to the end to influence them with our correct stands.

We must do the maximum, which principle permits, to avoid coming out openly against the Communist Party of China, but indirectly, after a time, there is no way to prevent the split from becoming obvious. This has its harmful aspects, but also its good aspects. The just struggle we have waged up to now against revisionists has opened the eyes of many people in the world, and they are able to understand quickly who is on the right road and who is not. **We must use both methods, to the Chinese we must openly express our views on everything, we must point out clearly our disagreements, everything about which we are not of the one opinion with them, while in the press we must publicly maintain an open stand on every problem, without mentioning the Chinese and regardless of whether it will be understood that it is directed against the Chinese views and stands.** This is the

only correct, Marxist-Leninist course. Wherever our opinions on certain actions are compatible, we shall be in accord, wherever we are not of one opinion we shall never be in agreement. If things reach the point of the breaking of relations and for our differences to come out in the open, let the Chinese do this, let them use even the Khrushchevite arsenal, if they want to. Then our fire will reply to them differently.

Cautiously and progressively, we must make the Party aware of this new situation, must strengthen and temper the Party and the people, and arm them for possible dangers in the future, and must strengthen our management of the economy. We must re-examine the draft-plan more closely in connection with these situations which exist. **It will be impossible to prevent the disagreements with the Chinese, which have begun on ideological and political questions, from influencing our economic relations with them.** Perhaps the effect will not come immediately and brutally, as Khrushchev acted, but the coercion, delays and pressures will come gradually. Therefore, we must not go blindly into investments and constructions, into an extensive development, because such a thing could break our backs; we must not become dependent on the credits they might grant us, because they might slow them down and cut them off at the moment they find most appropriate.

We must follow events and situations with great care, must be cool-headed, must always preserve our aplomb. **If up till now we have had to be patient and cool-headed ten times over, from now on we must be much more so, because the dangers will be more numerous, the situations more complicated, and the enemy cunning, strong and powerful.** Our responsibility will become even greater to our own people, as well as in the international arena, to the international communist movement. It is not a

matter of giving ourselves importance. We must preserve our Marxist modesty. **Although we are small, a small Party, a small people, we must perform the role and the task that belong to us honourably, courageously, valiantly, and to the end, to victory.**

We leaders have colossal responsibility and we shall do our duty to the end, until victory, because the Party is with us, we have a strong Party and we shall make it even stronger; because we have an heroic people, linked to the Party like flesh to bone; Marxism-Leninism is our ideology which guides us to victory.

A new epoch full of even sterner battles is opening to us. We are not afraid of the struggle. The people's song says, «The Albanians are fighting the Seven Kings». For us, as revolutionaries, it is a glory to fight and continue to fight till final victory. If the total victory is not achieved in our time, **we must hand on the torch to, and leave the banner of Marxism-Leninism unsullied in, the hands of communist and patriotic generations of our country and it will always wave unsullied in Albania, and the name of our heroic Party will be unsullied and glorious for ever.**

TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 3, 1964

THE CHINESE WANT TO IMPOSE THEIR OPINIONS ON US

The Chinese comrades are not behaving like Marxists and with modesty towards our criticisms. They are angry and their stands towards us are neither Marxist nor correct. They are displeased that we are not following them in the actions which they have decided to undertake with the Soviets. The Chinese want and are trying to impose their mistaken opinions and actions in this direction on us. They do not even agree to prior discussions with us about the common stands that should be maintained in the common interest.

In the new situation which was created after the fall of Khrushchev, a consultation at least between the communist and workers' parties of China, Albania, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, Japan, and New Zealand was absolutely essential. This was not done. The Chinese comrades avoided such a meeting earlier, and despite our repeated insistence, they are avoiding it again now.

Before any change, the leaders of the communist and workers' parties meet, discuss, define their stands and take decisions. This is essential. The problem is of a general character for the world communist movement, it does not have the character of a specific interest for a particular party, therefore **it was essential to hold a joint consultation at which the views of our parties would be put for-**

ward and discussed so we could come out with a common stand.

It is absurd and unacceptable that, without such a preliminary consultation, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China should come out and say to us: «This is how I judge matters, this is what I have decided, therefore you must follow me like a pet lamb»!

These are anti-Marxist methods which they themselves have condemned when others have wanted to impose them on us through the «conductor's baton». Now they are forgetting these evil actions of others, are adopting them without the slightest shame, and using them as if there were nothing wrong in this.

Of course, the refusal on our part ever to accept these wrong methods and stands leads to quarrels, disagreements, splits, and differences, and if errors are not caught in time, and if they are not understood and corrected immediately by those who make them, they get worse and gradually the road of Khrushchev is adopted.

What is impelling the Chinese to fall into this error of principle which is so simple and easily understood, but which has grave consequences for them and the international communist movement?

Petty-bourgeois conceit. This shows that the Chinese leadership is not so essentially modest as it pretends to be and as it says it is.

The spirit of great state and big party chauvinism. There is no speech and article in which they don't «denounce» these dangerous anti-Marxist views as such. They are constantly accusing the Soviet revisionists of this sin. But how can you describe their disdain for the other parties, for their opinions, individuality and dignity, such as Chou En-lai displayed, when in other words, he said, «Pack your suitcase and go to Moscow — to Canossa». These things cannot be described as anything but great-state and big-

party chauvinism. Chou En-lai's outlook must be no different from that of Kosygin, when the latter tried to convince me not to express our opinions at the Moscow Meeting in 1960, by saying to me: «You must bear in mind the prestige of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union». And I replied to Kosygin: «I love the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and I am protecting its prestige which you, yourselves, are violating. However, you, too, must consider the prestige of the Party of Labour of Albania».

The Chinese leaders consider, unrealistically, that the whole «victory» and «glory» in the exposure of Khrushchev and his elimination from the political scene belongs to them, that the others have been, as you might say, their «drummer-boys». Thus, they have made their judgements and decisions, prompted not by Marxist modesty, but by big-party chauvinism.

Nobody can deny the contribution of the Communist Party of China to this battle, but there are others who have not twiddled their thumbs and who «have not beaten the drum for nothing», but who have fought and made sacrifices, possibly proportionally even more than the Chinese. To underestimate the struggle of others is impermissible, but the others do not allow this, either, and are not concerned at all about your anger, which is unjust and out of place.

If the Chinese comrades do not stop their career down this course towards the Soviets, which was wrong from the start, if the Chinese comrades do not consult, discuss, and decide with the other communist and workers' parties, which have fought shoulder to shoulder in this struggle, if the Chinese comrades do not show themselves to be realists who judge events and their stands from a sound Marxist-Leninist platform, but are impelled by egoism, megalomania, or aims of domination, they will certainly slip into grave errors and will end up the losers.

Why did the Chinese comrades, who in words pose as models of «patience» (they had set 20 years for bringing down Khrushchev and they have set three hundred years for the triumph of socialism in China), not wait at least one month, until the «Soviet comrades» could have said at least two words about Khrushchev and two words about their line? Why this impatience to embrace the Soviets?! Why this great haste and zeal to go to Moscow «in order to help the Soviet comrades and the Soviet people»?!

A few months before Khrushchev was overthrown, and at a time when our struggle with him was at its fiercest, the Chinese comrades sent a telegram to «Dear Comrade Khrushchev» and wished him a «long life». «We did this,» they said, «because of our friendship with the Soviet peoples, in order to strengthen this friendship.» A fine way to strengthen it, by wishing him, who was digging the grave for the Soviet people, a long life!!

Today the Chinese comrades are rushing to go to Moscow as quickly as they can. Why? To assist the revisionist «dear comrades», the closest collaborators of the traitor, and «through them to help the revolutionary forces in the Soviet Union», etc., etc. **Astounding views!!!**

For us Marxists these reasons don't hold water. Behind them there are other, unhealthy, non-Marxist aims.

We do not bring down the Soviet leaders, it is up to their party and people to do, or not to do such a thing. Our correct militant stands should assist the Soviet revolutionaries to make the right decision.

The question arises: Can it be that by assisting the revisionists with such zeal you have assisted the Soviet revolutionaries?! To accept this means that you are not a revolutionary. Or is it a revolutionary gesture that, when the enemies of the revolution suffer a heavy defeat, precisely in these moments favourable for the revolution, you

rush to offer your hand to counterrevolutionaries to help them, at a time when not only are they giving no sign of any change but, on the contrary, are declaring loudly that they will continue on the treacherous course of the 20th and 22nd Congresses?! No, this is counterrevolutionary, anti-Marxist and revisionist.

After all, it was not required of you, Chinese comrades, to hurl yourselves into «major attacks», because you had broken off these polemical attacks long before, but could you not have been patient at least a few months in order to see what these «Soviet comrades» would do?!

Wouldn't it have been in order, legitimate, and dignified for your party and state, for the defeated enemies to have asked to come to you, to have been obliged to come to you? All these things are ABC.

Why are you so generous, to the point of opportunism, towards enemies, now at these moments, when yesterday, you demanded from the Soviet Union the «territories which it had seized from you», and «Mongolia which it had cut off from China», when you said the Rumanians were right to «demand Bukovina», etc., and said that «Stalin made mistakes over the borders», and that you did all these things and set about conciliation with the Rumanians, Poles, Germans and other revisionists like these, as pressure to isolate the Soviet Union? What are these stands? How can you change them so quickly in a matter of months? Why were you angry with us when we criticized you in a comradely way over these wrong stands? Your anger with us, who told you the truth, remained, while your incorrect «leftist» stands, your sectarian, even hostile stands towards the Soviet Union, have turned completely round to the right, and you describe them as Marxist, and at the same time, you still bear us a grudge because we say to you: «Let us discuss matters, don't be hasty».

It is evident that the Chinese comrades are making

mistakes. They have no stable line. There are waverings in their line, as far to the right as to the left, and their policy, likewise, cannot have a principled Marxist-Leninist stability.

Finally, let us also judge the Chinese stands by the *par l'absurde* method. Let us say that the Chinese comrades had full knowledge of the putsch against Khrushchev beforehand. They had been secretly informed by the Soviet «comrades». The Chinese comrades kept the secret from their Marxist-Leninist comrades in the struggle for no other reason, but for security (here we are judging all the time *par l'absurde*). Being aware of this impending putsch, the Chinese comrades slowed down the polemic, and left us to continue it, because this is what their secret tactic required. Fine. Now the putsch was carried out. Khrushchev was eliminated. This phase was over. The Chinese knew, we did not.

The second phase begins (always by the *par l'absurde* method). The Chinese comrades are informed about the future plans of the Soviet «comrades». They have told the Chinese: Today we shall do this, tomorrow that, the day after tomorrow something else, and so on; they have reached agreement with each other, and this plan is very good (I am still continuing by the *par l'absurde* method). But this new phase can no longer be a putsch phase. It is a constructive phase (always *par l'absurde*) which requires the co-ordination of actions by Marxist-Leninist parties.

In the first phase of the operation of the putsch, the Chinese comrades did not inform us of it, and they are continuing not to inform us even in the second phase, that of the «consolidation». Does this reasoning worked out by the *par l'absurde* method hold good? Not even this method can explain the wrong stands of the Chinese. It (the Communist Party of China) cannot deceive us for long, and cannot lead us, the other parties, by the nose, blindly, and say

to us, «Corne this way, because this is what I want, I know what I am doing. Yours is not to reason why». This is absurd !

Are the Chinese comrades fully convinced that the two biggest parties, the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of China, are going to solve and ought to solve all the problems in international communism, and the others ought to follow them meekly? Previously, there was one conductor's baton, and this did not please us (the Chinese). Now there must be two conductor's batons and they must act *à l'unisson**. Previously, you the Soviets with Stalin (continue the Chinese) walked all over us (the question of the pupil and the teacher). Stalin died. You the Soviets discredited him, meanwhile this opened up great expectations for us the Chinese. Khrushchev came, we applauded you, we were happy, but Khrushchev became a conductor with a heavy stick, who not only did not accept us (the Chinese) in the leadership of the world, but attacked us with his big stick.

Now Khrushchev has been liquidated. Great joy. We forget all you Khrushchevites have done to us, as long as you accept that the two of us, the Chinese and the Soviets, should conduct together now, and this, you the Soviets must accept, because Stalin made mistakes, Khrushchev made mistakes, only Mao has not made mistakes. It is «legitimate», «Marxist-Leninist» that in case you do not agree that I (the Chinese) should conduct and give leadership, we must at least agree that both of us should conduct, therefore if we two come to agreement, everything in this world will be put right!

But how will it be put right? We are the conscience of the world. But Marxism-Leninism? We are Marxism-Leninism.

---

* In unison (French in the original).

However, Marxism-Leninism does not teach us to act in this way. **Just as Marxism-Leninism struck one «conductor's baton» an iron blow to the head, it will strike an equally powerful blow at another «conductor's baton», or at two «conductor's batons» together, or a combined clique of other conductors.**

No, Chinese comrades, I am convinced that you are wrong, terribly wrong, and you should pull back from these mistakes, which will become dangerous, very dangerous, later. We, as Marxists, are greatly interested that you should not make mistakes, but although we are small, although our Party is a small party, although our people are a small people, no one has the power to shut our mouths, to stop us telling the truth, defending the truth, defending Marxism-Leninism.

WEDNESDAY
NOVEMBER 4, 1964

BEHIND THE TACTIC OF «WAITING» LIES A MARKED DOSE OF OPPORTUNISM

Chen Yi, who these days is visiting a number of states of Africa, expressed great confidence that a revisionist worse than Khrushchev cannot come to the head of the Soviet Union, and said that the three or four of the present main leaders in the Soviet Union were unimportant. According to him, even if they want to make an immediate change, they are unable to do so. The pressure by the partisans of Khrushchev and the revisionists of the socialist countries and those of the capitalist countries is impeding any change they might make, Chen Yi continued. They were able to remove Khrushchev vithout a congress, but for the line to be changed a congress must be held. If they change the line, this, according to Chen Yi, will have major repercussions in the Soviet Union, while in the other revisionist countries this will cause the counterrevolution to break out. Therefore, continued Chen Yi, the Soviet leaders will proceed cautiously, and we must help them. «We must not be hasty in our stand towards the Soviet leadership», he said. «We must help them and wait; and in this way there is no danger that, in helping them, it will be thought that we are helping revisionism». Chen Yi also said, «They could correct certain mistakes of the party, and we should be satisfied with the correction of some minor mistakes». **He said that they would not talk publicly about the mistakes of the**

Soviet leadership, because that would be repeating the mistakes made over Stalin; we want them to correct their mistakes gradually, while treating them in a comradely way, and keeping these mistakes within the fraternal parties, so they do not become public.

Apart from other things, this new, allegedly reasonable tactic of waiting and patience by the Chinese comrades conceals a marked dose of opportunism and unjustifiable giving way on their former positions, and expresses a spirit of unfounded optimism and hope and the belief that the present Soviet leaders will make gradual changes. The Chinese comrades put forward the excuse that even if the Soviet «comrades» want to make rapid changes, they cannot do so, because this would lead them to catastrophe.

Hence, according to the Chinese comrades, we ought to give up our revolutionary tactics and adopt the tactics of the Soviet leadership, when it is already known for certain that they are not going to proceed on this course, which Chen Yi advocates. If it is argued that Khrushchev was sacked by the anti-revisionists (and this is an erroneous thesis), the Chinese could support the thesis: «Look! The bringing down of Khrushchev was the first step and the major one, therefore these anti-revisionists will gradually go even further». But the more correct thesis must be accepted i.e., the Soviet revisionists removed Khrushchev, not because these Soviet leaders are anti-revisionist, but out of necessity, because they could not advance any further on the revisionist road with Khrushchev; while without Khrushchev and with other revisionists they can go further and more confidently.

Of these two theses, the latter, our thesis is better backed by facts; the former thesis, the Chinese thesis, expresses desires and suppositions. For the Chinese thesis to be verified, the Soviet «comrades» must give concrete

proofs; and we are neither deaf nor dumb in the face of proofs and facts.

In regard to the aid which we ought to give the Soviets, here too, there are two kinds of aid, two kinds of tactics, which are essentially different. **The tactic of the Chinese is not revolutionary, it is opportunist. Ours is revolutionary aid also to those who truly intend to make a change, even if a gradual one, but, in particular, it is aid to the revolutionary forces in the Soviet Union, and not only in the Soviet Union (the Chinese are wrong again on this question and underestimate these forces), but also to the revolutionaries in the countries of people's democracy and the communists of capitalist countries.**

The cessation of the polemic as a result of this non-revolutionary, opportunist stand of the Chinese comrades means that we allow the revisionists to brainwash the revolutionary forces in the countries of people's democracy and in the capitalist countries and feed them with their propaganda, because, naturally, if the Chinese tactic is to be followed, we must remain silent about the main centre of modern revisionism, the Soviet Union, and must discount Titoism, hence we must remain completely silent about the other revisionists like the Gomulkas, Kadars, and others.

Moreover, if we were to follow the opportunist tactics of the Chinese, we would be leaving the political and ideological direction of our struggle «at the tender mercies» of the new Soviet leadership and it will set the tone in whatever direction and to the extent it desires, because the Chinese say, «We must be patient, must wait, and be satisfied with some minor corrections which the Soviet leadership might make».

The Soviet leadership will work on its own account, and as it thinks, we others should fold our arms, wait for

their initiatives, follow whatever it does, and hence, it will lead us in fact.

It is true that there are profound contradictions amongst the revisionists. We ask the Chinese comrades: Will the Soviet leadership try to settle these contradictions with its comrades-in-arms in the struggle against Marxism-Leninism in the direction of our views or in the direction of modern revisionism? Why, will the modern revisionists forgive us so readily for the defeats we have inflicted on them?! Are the revisionists so ready to come over to us «eager and rejoicing», or will they try to get us into their clutches? The answers to these questions have long been clear to us. With these wavering stands which the Chinese are adopting, it is difficult for them to give the proper answers to these questions, indeed they cannot answer them at all, or will reply only with surmises, with «hopes», with «patience», etc.

The other serious, very serious question is the position taken by the Chinese (and this is the position of all modern revisionists), that the criticism over the mistakes and crimes of Khrushchev should not be made public, should be kept within the fraternal parties, allegedly, so that the enemy should not benefit from them, as «it did from the mistakes which Khrushchev made when he attacked Stalin».

A problem which must be put in the forefront, and which the Chinese are doing nothing about, is: Will it be permitted any longer that all the filth that was thrown at Stalin by the modern revisionists, and by the Soviet revisionists, first of all, should be allowed to stand? Will Stalin be rehabilitated, or not? Are the Soviet revisionists going to admit where and how greatly they and Khrushchev have been wrong over Stalin?

If this major issue of principle is not settled, how can the Chinese comrades arrive at the other issue of princi-

ple, which is that of the public condemnation of Khrushchev, the public denunciation of his ideological, political and organizational betrayal? Now, the Chinese want to close this latter question, to keep quiet about it. To trample on such issues of principle, to act in such a way, is anti-Marxist, is betrayal. The Chinese comrades may say to us: Let us suppose that we disagree with you Albanians on the question of Stalin. Then we have the right to ask: But on the question of Khrushchev, do you agree that he is a traitor? They will reply: Yes. Then we shall say: How is it possible to accept that Khrushchev's betrayal of Marxism-Leninism should be concealed (because this is what their comrades want), and that we should accept this treacherous view and refrain from fighting for the rehabilitation of the colossal figure of Stalin, and for the unmasking of the renegade Khrushchev?

No, the Chinese comrades are right off the beam. Their ideological and political speculations are not Marxist, they are sophisms, you can call them what you like, but not Marxist. These mistakes will take them a long way down their road if they don't pull back before it is too late. Mistake leads to mistake, and when you continue to judge things wrongly, then you are in a blind alley and groping in the dark. We shall and must try to influence them, but I feel that this is becoming more difficult every year with the Chinese. However, Marxists must never lose all hope.

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 5, 1964

THE NEW COURSE OF THE CHINESE COMRADES IS HARMFUL TO THE COMMUNIST MOVEMENT

The new course towards modern revisionism, which the Chinese comrades announced, will have grave consequences to the detriment of the international communist movement. This is an opportunist course of conciliation, a very dangerous, unprincipled concession without perspective, or to put it more correctly, with a gloomy perspective for the Communist Party of China.

Chou En-lai went to Moscow full of enthusiasm. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China acted brutally on this matter, rejecting even the simplest norms of relations with people, not to speak of the Marxist-Leninist norms and principles which link comrades and friends with one another in the struggle. Meanwhile Kim Il Sung did not go to Moscow for the celebration, contrary to Chou En-lai's orders (Kim Il Sung, up to a point, is for this conciliatory line); and his failure to go to Moscow demonstrates at least a certain independence and dignity on the part of the Korean Workers' Party.

As far as we know at present, the new friends of the Chinese, the Rumanians, also, did not accept Chou En-lai's dictate that Dej should go to Moscow at a time when the other revisionists like Gomulka, Kadar, Novotny, Ulbricht and Zhivkov are going there.

This shows clearly that the going of the delegation

of the Communist Party and the Government of China to Moscow in these undignified conditions and with these servile, opportunist spirit and aims is not bringing any glory to the Communist Party of China, as its leaders may have thought. **On the one hand, the Chinese delegation that went to Moscow abandoned the revolutionary line, betrayed and scorned its revolutionary comrades and friends, while on the other hand, in Moscow it will not find a group of friends and comrades who will carry it shoulder-high in triumph, but revisionist enemies.** These revisionist enemies have not abandoned and are not going to abandon their treacherous positions to please the Chinese, or to fulfil their plans and dreams. No, they will stick to their revisionist positions and lure the Chinese, too, into these positions. The famous Chou En-lai will find himself in a wasps' nest. Serve him right. But why should the international communist movement suffer for the perfidy of these unscrupulous and unprincipled individuals?

Chou En-lai's going to Moscow with these aims and in these circumstances does not mean that he will have the initiative there, as the Chinese are prattling, but the revisionists will have it, and **the revisionists have achieved their primary aim: to deceive the international communist movement with the «glad tidings» that the first friendly contact has been made and the phase of extinguishing the polemics has been reached.** This will have immediate consequences in the interests of the revisionist cliques in power and those in the capitalist countries; for a time, this will stun the revolutionary groups and new Marxist-Leninist parties everywhere in the world, throw them into confusion and cause them great vacillations.

Of course, the revisionists who are in power are not going to publicize this success of theirs in favour of the Communist Party of China (only simpletons could think like the Chinese). They will use it to strengthen their own

positions, to definitely suck in the waverers, and to disorganize, bemuse, and expose the Marxists by describing them as dogmatist anti-party, etc. The first accusation and argument, which they will use against their Marxist-Leninists is: «You were pro-Chinese, but, as you see, China has changed its stand, it has submitted, no longer engages in polemics, no longer speaks against Khrushchev, and we are linked in a Marxist-Leninist friendship», etc. Then, «What more do you want, what sort of people are you?». Regardless of the fact that the genuine revolutionaries know what to reply and will reply, for a time, until the fog clears, they will be in great difficulty, and they will have the Chinese to «thank» for this.

Thus, on the one hand, the Chinese stop the polemics against the modern revisionists, and on the other hand, the modern revisionists exalt their course as «correct», «far-sighted» and «Marxist-Leninist». And what has the Communist Party of China gained from all this? What revolutionary initiative does it hold? If we are talking of initiative, then we cannot deny that the Communist Party of China holds only the initiative to help propagate modern revisionism and weaken the revolutionary movement, weaken the communist comrades throughout the world, who had understood the matter properly and had launched themselves into the struggle in an organized way.

The revisionist cliques which are dominant in the «communist» parties in the capitalist countries will also benefit in the same way from this new course of the Chinese. For those parties, this course was an unexpected great victory, just as great as the liquidation of Khrushchev was for us. Those parties had been shaken to their foundations, were splitting. The genuine revolutionary forces within them were moving towards a break. Now they are recovering themselves, and for this they have to thank the «Chinese elixir» which Chou En-lai and his

comrades manufactured. These cliques have not lost a feather, the 20th and 22nd Congresses stand, and they will trumpet that, willy-nilly, the Chinese came over to their side. The French have an expression, *«Paris vaut bien une messe»**, hence for them, this victory makes «the removal of Khrushchev from his posts worth-while», because he is not condemned, not exposed, and his mistakes and betrayal are not even made known publicly. And the «Chinese comrades» support this.

In these circumstances, the situation and struggle of our revolutionary Marxist-Leninist comrades in the capitalist countries becomes very difficult. They have been branded as «pro-Chinese», because they defended the correct positions of the Chinese comrades. But now, revisionists like Burnel will say to them: «You will do what the Chinese have done. You will come to kiss our hand, and acknowledge the 'mistakes' you have committed towards our 'party' and our 'marvelous' line. Hence, come to be judged!»!!

In following this revisionist course what will the Chinese comrades advise the Australian, Belgian, Indian, French and other comrades? **«Stop the polemic and unite! Find a common language with the revisionists, with Sharky, with Burnel, with Dange, etc.; form a fraternal unity, because this is what our interests require, this is what Mao has thought and decided in Peking» (and what Mao has decided is as if it has been decided not by Marx but by super-Marx).** This is what Chou En-lai told us, therefore why should he not say it to them?

We have to deal with the Soviet revisionists, while our comrades abroad have to deal not only with the Soviet revisionists, but also with the internal revisionists like Sharky, Dange, Burnel, etc. Or are the Chinese going to

---

* «Paris is worth a mass» (said by Henry IV in 1593) (French in the original).

say to these comrades: «Continue to struggle against your revisionists!»? But this is not logical, this is in flagrant opposition to the course which they are pursuing. They will say to the Chinese: «How can we continue to struggle against Burnel and cease the struggle against the father that produced, raised, and fed Burnel? How can we accept the thesis of the modern revisionists that we must fight 'the madmen' and not expose the chief of American imperialism?». A «great initiative» the Chinese comrades are holding, a «revolutionary initiative»! And all they have in their hands is the stench, the filthy stench of their course.

Such an anti-Marxist course cannot continue for long, it won't be long before it is exposed, because this course, this line, is simply a capitulation on bended knees to the modern revisionists. Marxism-Leninism can never be brought to submission, it will triumph, but the damage which the Chinese are causing is colossal, hence the struggle of the Marxists becomes more difficult, more complicated, but never hopeless and despairing. Genuine Marxist-Leninists never lose sight of the perspective and never despair.

In these complicated situations, full of dangers, until the other Marxist-Leninist parties that take a good stand define their position in this new phase, our Party has a heavy, but glorious duty. Many Marxist-Leninists throughout the world will look to the course of our Party and its stands with trust and many of them will follow us, will be inspired by the correct course of our Party, by the consistency of its line, by its lofty principled line and its heroism. Many will seek our aid. In order to fully deserve the great trust which the Marxists in the world have, and will have even more after this, in our Party, we must continue to fight as we have always done, under the banner of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, without yielding, and we must and will be always worthy of this trust and this honour.

SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 7, 1964

BREZHNEV IS TRYING TO FOOL THE CHINESE FIRST OF ALL

A rubber speech on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. Only inveterate opportunists and revisionists could write such a speech, neither fish nor fowl, a speech which tries to please everybody, but satisfies nobody, and especially tries to fool the wavering Marxists and the Chinese comrades, first of all.

It was expected that this speech would clear up something, but it cleared up nothing, or more correctly, it made clear all those things which we Albanian communists had thought of in advance. This speech was a reflection of the spiritual and material state of the Soviet revisionists and their cohorts, it showed how thunder-struck they are at the catastrophe they have suffered, and the fear which has seized them about the future, their hesitations over how to delay the catastrophe, if they prove unable to prevent it. Faced with the great difficulties, which they have created, with the fire which their treacherous policy has brought upon them from all sides, faced with countless contradictions in which they are wallowing, and their fear of the Marxist-Leninists and the Soviet people, the Soviet revisionists, with fear in their bellies, try to patch up the tense situation with this rubber speech, try to apply balm

to the wounds, to give others a dose of opium in order to escape from this dangerous chaos for the moment.

The main objectives of this speech are:

a) **To calm the internal situation. To weaken the revolutionary situation** simply with the demonstrative fact of the removal of Khrushchev, while implying, «Khrushchev had made mistakes. We spoke of these in the party basic organizations, and with what we alluded to in the papers. There are other grave mistakes and exaggerations which you are aware of yourselves, but you can hope that slowly, little by little, everything will be put in order. In order to maintain the prestige of the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, we cannot go further now. Gradually, we must correct some flagrant economic mistakes (here, naturally, we have to work and moreover tighten the belt, and Khrushchev is to blame for this), and respect certain norms of the party (for a time there will not be many photographs of Brezhnev and Kosygin). And here is the first proof of the struggle against the cult of the individual: one person does not hold two main posts in the party and the government», etc., etc.

In this way, with a bagful of such demagogy, the revisionists will strive to sooth the discontent within the country.

The partisans of Khrushchev and the internal revisionists have things easier, because, although Khrushchev has gone, the Khrushchevites remained in power, the line remained unaltered, the «changes» which they intend to make will be carried out under their direction, therefore they are given to understand that they can maintain their nostalgia and admiration for Khrushchev, but must close their ranks round the new Khrushchevite leadership, because «otherwise we are done for, the revolution will break out». And when the revolution breaks out, everyone knows who wins. Therefore, they are reminded: We must avoid

the revolution, in the end we have even to suppress it, but we lose little if we make some concessions and throw the blame on Khrushchev — the «scapegoat». In this way, the revisionist leadership will consolidate its ranks.

Brezhnev's speech told them that they lost nothing with the fall of Khrushchev, his line, the line of the 20th, 21st and 22nd Congresses remains unchanged. While for the Soviet Marxists and revolutionaries, Brezhnev's speech was heavily larded with principled formulae about «unity», «criticism, self-criticism», «collective leadership», etc.

b) **To placate the revisionist cliques outside the Soviet Union.** Certainly, the contradictions which have existed between them and the Soviet Union will become even deeper; with the Italians and the Rumanians, they have come out in the open, but with the others, too, although they have not come out in the open, they were no less acute. The fall of Khrushchev will make them even more acute, not so much because their «hearts bleed for Khrushchev», but because they are concerned about themselves, their own stability.

The very fact that the revisionist cliques lost the «Polar Star», notwithstanding that they fought and quarrelled with him, as well as obeyed him, and exerted pressure on him, and in this way the light of their «Star» was being dimmed and they no longer have a «Polar Star», both pleases and frightens them. It pleases them because they are now free to think and act as they like. They can go to bed with the United States of America, just as they can with Britain, and possibly even with the two together. On the other hand, it frightens them because Khrushchev, this branded traitor, is no longer for them, not because those who replaced the traitor are not like him, but because they are the same sort of traitors who are sitting on burning coals. Hence, from this angle, even that alleged Marxist-Leninist unity has died.

Each of these revisionist groupings, in power or not, will declare itself independent in the full meaning of the term. The Czech and the French leaders have begun to declare it, and tomorrow the others will do so in turn. Yesterday they were swearing by the 20th and the 22nd Congresses, today they are speaking about them in lower tones, tomorrow they will be quite silent and will allegedly maintain the spirit of these congresses. The Soviets fought for hegemony, but they came up against polycentrism. Now, decentralism and anarchy will develop fully under the slogans of the «banner of Marxism-Leninism», «proletarian unity», the «unity of the international communist movement».

The revisionist groups are listening diffidently to the «beautiful words» of the Chinese, in whom they have not the slightest trust, but are also watching the Soviets distrustfully to see to what extent they are going to swallow the «dithyrambs» coming so unexpectedly from the Chinese comrades. Are the «big two» going to unite, are they going to make the law, and be like a sword of Damocles hanging over our heads? — think the revisionists. Should we sit meekly with our mouths open and await salvation from heaven? — ask the «small» revisionists. They do not trust either the one or the other, and their distrust will increase; they will certainly react. Not only will the Soviet revisionists make no concession to the Chinese, but also the revisionist groupings will exert pressure from their independent platform to prevent any concession being made. The Chinese must be repelled, brought to their knees, disarmed, and follow the course of the revisionists. Hence, the Soviet revisionists do not have a peaceful situation from this aspect, and they are making efforts to calm it.

Brezhnev's speech paid attention to this question, telling them: Nothing has changed, everything goes on

as before; the 20th, 21st, and 22nd Congresses are in order, our alliances are in order; with good or bad grace I'll relax my hold on you (until I strengthen my position and until the situation is more favourable; then the «ugly duckling turns into a beautiful swan»). Hence in the direction of the Chinese, no concession. Let them be satisfied with the fact that we removed Khrushchev and let them live in hopes like that fox in the fable who followed the ram in the hope that his balls would drop off at some turn of the road.

c) **To placate the Chinese, to fool them into stopping the polemic** and gradually to shackle them. Both sides are proceeding on this principle, who will deceive the other, and who will shackle the other first. The principles of the struggle are no longer revolutionary, certainly either from the Soviet side, or from the Chinese side. Both sides are pursuing the tactic of a cat and mouse game.

Although Brezhnev's speech makes no concession in principle to the Chinese, in the way it was constructed it creates certain superficial illusions, spreads a few drops of «synthetic honey» to keep the fly buzzing around. But the fact is that the Chinese, who thought they were going to enter Moscow like Caesar entering Rome and would send a telegram to Peking saying *veni, vidi, vici*, did not achieve this. On the one hand, Brezhnev defended the regime and triumph of Johnson and on the other hand, he managed to satisfy the hopes of the Chinese with the «threat of Malinovsky» to the Americans. As if such things, indeed even more threatening, have not been said before by Khrushchev and by Malinovsky himself!

In a word, the two sides have the same tactics. The Soviets say: We must proceed slowly, cautiously, because we cannot get the shackles on the Chinese all at once, but with patience, with a little honey, a little sugar, we shall introduce the poison pill and then, once they have swallowed it, matters will take their own course. The thing is

that we must compromise them, make them like ourselves ideologically, but as to the contradictions in our course, they will never be eliminated. This is clear! It is the law of force, the law of the jungle, that settles accounts amongst this lot.

For their part, the Chinese are following the same tactic: We must be patient, we must not attack them, we must sing them lullabies and gradually slip the handcuffs on them, under our direction. Moreover, say the Chinese, this tactic is one we know and has proved fruitful. This is like the history of General Fu Tsa-yi, a Chiang Kai-shek general, who was defeated by the communists, surrendered, and Mao made him Minister of Water Resources and Energy, and Vice-Chairman of the Military Commission of China. This is authentic. The Chinese comrades are basing their present policy in regard to the new Soviet leadership on this imbecile experience. One can imagine the results of such a policy.

d) **To placate the American imperialists.** In this direction, Brezhnev's speech gives complete satisfaction and assurances to the former allies of Khrushchev who still remain their allies. Brezhnev says to the Americans: «You have no reason to worry, we are not changing our course in our relations with you, indeed you ought to be pleased, because we are not going to tell you: 'We shall bury you', as Khrushchev blurted out. With us things are going to proceed 'quietly, gently and to our mutual satisfaction'». Over certain minor tactical matters Brezhnev tells the Americans: We shall reach agreement over the hot line which we have established between the Kremlin and the White House.

e) **Brezhnev has nothing to give the genuine Marxist-Leninists in the world.** They are his resolute enemies who are going to bury the modern revisionists under whatever disguise they are hidden. They are ruining the sleep of all

these categories of revisionists whom Brezhnev's speech is designed to placate. These categories will have no peace, nor will they ever have.

Therefore Brezhnev's speech has solved nothing. All the hosannas of the Soviet revisionists about the «brilliant road», the «great party», which they have disgraced, the «Leninist» road, which is nothing but betrayal, amount to beating a broken drum. All this is like the noise from a tin can tied to a dog's tail.

At such favourable moments for the international communist movement, it is a tragedy to assist the detested revisionists, as the Chinese, basing themselves on the experience of the Chiang Kai-shek general, Fu Tsa-yi, intend to do, and to reject the experience of the world Marxist marshals: Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin.

SUNDAY
NOVEMBER 8, 1964

A SCANDALOUS STAND, EVERYTHING THEY SAY IS HYPOCRITICAL, WITH DISHONEST AIMS

Astounding articles and speeches! I believe that even in the golden age of Sino-Soviet friendship, the Chinese could rarely have written articles so enthusiastic about the Sino-Soviet friendship as this in the newspaper «Renmin Ribao» on the occasion of the 47th anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution. And these are written only a few weeks after the fall of Khrushchev and after a period of unprecedented public polemic. Matters have gone so far that they are saying, amongst other things: «Mao has taught the Chinese to follow the Russians», or, «we Chinese are amazed and enthused by the majestic successes which the Soviet Union has achieved in these forty-seven years», etc. And they are writing all this when, only a few months ago, the Chinese were saying that the Soviets were short of bread and buying it from the Americans.

Truly a scandalous, undignified stand, everything they say is false and hypocritical, to achieve certain aims in dishonest ways. But no one, least of all the Soviet revisionists, is being taken in by all these «bouquets», these «avowals of love» or «oaths of boundless loyalty». In fact, the Soviets welcome these things because, although they do not deceive anyone, at least they bring out clearly the *bizarre*, complicated, vacillating character of the Chinese leaders.

Naturally, the Chinese hope to kill two birds with one stone, to deceive the new Soviet leaders, to assist them in these difficult moments for them in the eyes of the Soviet people, to give them a hand «against the pressure of foreign revisionists», «to intrigue and frighten the imperialists», «to steel their friendship with the Soviet people», etc., etc. We can go on in this strain as long as you like. A brilliant tactic!!! One had only to invent it. It was the fertile brain of Chou En-lai that gave birth to this tactic. But as for the opposite effect that this tactic may have, this never crossed the mind of the Chinese leadership.

The whole article is pervaded from start to finish by this exalted tone, and in his speech at the commemorative evening the Chinese comrade went so far as to fail to mention the «struggle» against modern revisionism for the sake of form, at least. Meanwhile, all of them, with the exception of Mao, from Liu Shao-chi down to the last, went to the dinner which the Soviet ambassador in Peking put on on the occasion of the anniversary of the October Revolution. But the beauty of it is (and for this we rely on the Hsinhua report) that the Soviet ambassador said only a few words of welcome and proposed a toast without deigning to mention either the name of Mao or that of Liu, who was present at the celebration. Meanwhile Chen Yi delivered a long speech of five or six pages (still according to Hsinhua), and what a speech! And what toasts! And all of them naming definite people. It is truly unimaginable! Inconceivable to us! Even if Molotov had come to the head of the party, we would have restrained ourselves to some extent. But the Chinese were absolutely unrestrained.

However, in case of any eventuality, and also to preserve the facade, in their leading article, they pretend to maintain some positions, and these are: in one place they mention the term «the socialist camp», but only

amongst the paeans of praise. In one place they mention «Lenin-Stalin» more as a formula, they mention Khrushchev, and he is described as a traitor, etc.

The positions of the struggle against imperialism, peaceful coexistence, remain as before, but all these incorporated in an article of such a spirit and tone that they come out feebly, as padding, or just for appearances' sake. In the first place, the article means: We must kiss and make up, and as for the other things, we will find the way to solve them later, gradually, step by step.

All these are bad signs. We must be vigilant. **The interests of the Homeland, the Party, and Marxism-Leninism do not permit us ever to be lacking in vigilance against anyone whatsoever**, even at the slightest sign of vacillation. It is our duty to advise and assist those who waver; if they scorn our help, or behave arrogantly, and seek to lord it over us, we must put them in their place, while resolutely pursuing our correct Marxist-Leninist course unwaveringly.

SUNDAY
NOVEMBER 15, 1964

WHAT RESULTS DID CHOU EN-LAI ACHIEVE IN MOSCOW?

Nothing is leaking out. To their Albanian comrades, the Chinese are maintaining dead silence. Naturally, this is not in order, neither friendly, comradely, nor Marxist. Meanwhile the revisionists, for their part, have reported to one another and are co-ordinating their actions. The Chinese comrades did not make the effort to inform us, even in a confidential way, about the content of the letter which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China received from the Soviets in connection with the demotion of Khrushchev. This shows, of course, and we cannot interpret it otherwise, that the Chinese comrades are maintaining reserve towards us to this degree. Meanwhile, the disregard of the Chinese to reply to our letter on the question of their borders with the Soviet Union, their not deigning to tell us whether they have retracted the great gaffe they made before Chervonenko in connection with us, and the fact that they are not giving the slightest indication about the memorandum which we sent them in connection with «the situation created after the fall of Khrushchev», show openly that the Chinese leadership is not in order with us, it has blundered into a blind alley.

The great enthusiasm and euphoria which was created among the Chinese with Chou En-lai's going to Moscow,

was expressed in the first days by all the ambassadors of China in all the countries where we have ambassadors. Indeed there were Chinese ambassadors who began to take a cold stand, make a wry face, when our ambassadors expressed the view of our Party.

After the 7th of November, the enthusiasm of the Chinese ambassadors gradually began to wear. First they said, «we shall see», then they continued with, «we thought to help them in case they change», then «our tactic was based on undue enthusiasm», until they reached the point of saying, «they are revisionists and will not change, and we must continue the polemic», and finally, «we thought that they (the Soviets) would take the opportunity to put all the blame on Khrushchev, but they did not do even this».

This latter is the prize anti-Marxist «bouquet» of the Chinese ambassador in Bucharest. In other words, according to this ambassador, if the Soviet revisionists had put the blame on Khrushchev, everything would be in order, and we could embrace them. This is like the old Chinese tactic: when Khrushchev criticized Stalin, they supported Khrushchev and rejoiced in the hope that everything would go well. But everybody knows what came out of these activities. This is one aspect.

The other aspect, Chou En-lai's staying such a long time in Moscow holding talks, shows that nothing has gone «well», according to the plans and «brilliant tactics» of the Chinese. During the whole period of Chou En-lai's stay in Moscow, the Chinese press wrote nothing, while every day the Soviet press carries leading articles which confirm the previous line in all directions. Every day the Soviets say, «For us nothing has changed, and the question of Khrushchev is an internal matter of ours». Hence, if the Chinese have decided to assist the «dear Soviet comrades», as Chou En-lai declared to us officially, then

we can say without reservation that this is truly betrayal.

What sort of deals have been put together in Moscow? This we do not know. But there is no doubt that the meeting of the 15th of December has been postponed. The Chinese will boast of this as a great victory of theirs. How ridiculous that will be!!

They may also have decided on some bilateral meeting to continue the «talks» in Peking. This, too, will be trumpeted by the Chinese as a great success, because the ice has been broken, etc., etc.

Finally «a great success» for the two sides was achieved (because things have come to this point now) — the cessation of the polemic. The Chinese will say, for the time being (until the meeting arranged has been held), but it might continue even longer, because another meeting, and then another, will be arranged, and so it will go on.

Along with the bag of successes he achieved in Moscow, Chou En-lai will not fail to bring to Peking the special impressions from «his profound observations», «his brilliant judgements», from the «handshakes», the «equivocal words», the «open and enigmatic smiles», from the «immediate and distant aims», the «open and disguised expressions of the various revisionist chiefs» whom he met and talked with in Moscow. And from all this a line, a «mature, far-sighted, Marxist-Leninist, Chinese» stand, will emerge. We shall see what sort of hodgepodge it will be, but the fact is they «farewelled» Chou En-lai from Moscow with a four-gun «salute» with real shells, and not blanks, as the Chinese say, with four strong anti-Chinese articles written in the magazine «Problems of Peace and Socialism», the November issue, by Duclos, Longo, Tim Buck and Fürnberg.

What will the Chinese do in the face of this situation, this defeat for them? What they have done at other times. Their «Decalogue» (**1**) has not been completed, there is still another article. (Before it came to an end, the «Balli Kombëtar», at least published its full decalogue.) They begin the publication in series of articles by Ulbricht, Longo, and others and continue with our articles from «Zëri i popullit». Hence, for their own part they fold their hands, defend themselves with our articles, pose in the international arena as if we are urged by them and give us the alleged «satisfaction» that they are taking the trouble to publish our articles, while, in reality, they are not in agreement with our views.

By bothering to publish our articles, the Chinese seem as if they are saying to us: «See, we are with you», but at the same time, they are also with the revisionists because they are printing their articles, too, and pretend to say to us, «See, by publishing your articles, we are making self-criticism, and you are fighting from outside while we from inside».

No! All these manoeuvres, these tactics, are neither honest nor Marxist. But what of it, we are doing what we have to do. The world knows how to judge.

---

1 Ironical allusion to the ten-point «program» proclaimed by the traitor organization «Balli Kombëtar» during the years of the National Liberation War of our people. The Chinese leadership, also, had declared that it would publish ten articles against Khrushchevite revisionism.

WEDNESDAY
NOVEMBER 18, 1964

THE CHINESE PRESS IS SILENT ABOUT OUR ARTICLES AND PUBLISHES THE SPEECHES OF SOVIET LEADERS

The Chinese press has remained almost totally silent. Even those articles which it has written during this time since the fall of Khrushchev are spineless. It has published only the speeches of the new Soviet leaders and some quotations «without clear content» from the speeches by some leader of the Communist Party of Indonesia. In regard to the reprinting of our articles, from the fall of Khrushchev up till now, nothing has been done, either in the official newspapers or even in the internal bulletins, or even as simple news. Nothing. Hence it is clear that **in essence they are in opposition to our views, that they have a new line, that they have adopted a new stand following the fall of Khrushchev**, and that they have issued directives to the party and the people about this new stand. Thus it is clear that they do not want to inform Chinese opinion about our views.

Of course, now they are discussing what Chou En-lai brought them from Moscow. It remains to be seen how they will judge matters, and what stand they will adopt. And their stand towards us and our line will depend on this. If they are in opposition to us, then Mao's tactic of, «we are not going to engage in polemics with you Albanians», will be used, and thus they will withhold

our views from the Chinese people, because if they are made known to them, the contradiction automatically emerges. Thus, even their allegation that they «publish everything», both from friends and enemies, has now started to be applied with nuances, because although the Chinese do not consider us enemies, their current line is not in accord with ours.

If they see the question of the new Soviet leadership more realistically, then their stand will change and their enthusiasm will cool. Then they will begin the series of our publications in their newspapers for many tactical aims which we are aware of.

Although the contacts with our people in Peking are cold, we learn that the Chinese are spreading rumours that they «are not budging from Marxist-Leninist principles», that they «are not reeds that bend from one side to the other». We like this, but their recent actions do not confirm it.

From reliable sources, we learn that, when he left Moscow, Chou En-lai was supposed to go through Bucharest, of course, to hold talks «with Comrade Dej», to exchange opinions and to define a stand. But, apparently, this project was abandoned, because it stank too much, and Chou En-lai returned from Moscow directly to Peking. Time will confirm this, too.

Also the Chinese ambassador in Algiers told our ambassador, in passing, that part of the delegation which was with Chen Yi did not board the aircraft to return to China, but in the form of a «government delegation», went to Rome where it was to make contact with the Italian comrades to learn what they think about the new Soviet leaders.

What «beautiful», «clever» diplomacy! We do not oppose their going wherever they like, that is their affair, but since the stands of our two parties were the same

in regard to the Italians, too, to act behind our backs, or to fail to exchange opinions, even briefly, with us, about the «pure Italians» whom we have right under our noses, is neither comradely, nor Marxist, nor even bourgeois diplomacy, let alone proletarian diplomacy. But on this, too, time will tell who is right.

WEDNESDAY
NOVEMBER 18, 1964

CHOU EN-LAI'S IDEA OF SETTING UP ANOTHER UNO WILL NOT SUCCEED

The Chinese comrades supported the gesture of Indonesia which withdrew from the UNO because of the election of Malaysia to the Security Council. It seems to me that, in principle, this support is correct, not only because the withdrawal of Indonesia was reasonable, but especially because of the fact that the UNO, under the influence of the United States of America, and now with the intrigues of the Soviets, is doing many evil things against the peoples, interferes in their internal affairs, intervenes with weapons, inflicts bloodshed on the peoples, and hides all these things behind its signboard.

Another very serious matter to the detriment of peace and the interests of the peoples is that **American imperialism and its allies have closed the door of the UNO to People's China, an important factor in the peaceful development of the world situation.** Likewise, the policy of international gendarme of the United States of America, for its interests of war and the enslavement of other peoples, is not only preventing the unification of Korea, Vietnam, Germany, etc., but is also preventing their admission to the United Nations Organization. In these conditions, the United Nations Organization has become a tool in the hands of American imperialism.

I believe that the withdrawal of Indonesia was a good serious warning against American imperialism, against the intrigues and opportunist stands of the modern revisionists, who are also using the UNO for the sake of appearances, to make some demagogic speech, but also to sing in harmony with the Americans in the lobbies. The fact is that **on the admission of China to the UNO, they hold, a** *discours* **only once a year**; they have acted together with the Americans on the Congo, over Malaysia they have done nothing concrete, and so on for the other problems.

On the other hand, the withdrawal of Indonesia tells the other peoples that it is possible to live outside the UNO, that the rights of any state can be defended even outside this organization. On this question, Soekarno adopted a good stand, although with some delay. He should have adopted this stand from the time the so-called Malaysia was admitted as a member of the UNO. **This may leave some doubts in regard to Soekarno's «unwavering stand» on this question later, for example, after the expiry of Malaysia's term as a non-permanent member of the Security Council. When Malaysia leaves the Council, it may happen that Soekarno will return to the UNO.**

There is no doubt that the admission of Malaysia to the UNO was a provocation of the Anglo-Americans against Indonesia, and in general, in order to extend the armed conflicts in those parts and to involve China, too. Soekarno had made many declarations before that he would soon «attack» and «liquidate» Malaysia, and here he was not referring to guerrilla war. Having information (possibly) about Soekarno's future actions, or having carefully set up this provocation through their men within Indonesia, it is possible that the Anglo-Americans put Malaysia into the Security Council to touch off the fuse. The British interests in Malaysia are major ones. On

the other hand, the Americans, too, are very interested in extending the conflict in South Vietnam and escaping defeat. However, this plot failed temporarily, because Soekarno declared that he did not intend to attack Malaysia, while the British have the aim of attacking Indonesia.

This is how things stand. China supports Indonesia, and all of us support it. We Albanians could not support the withdrawal of Indonesia from the UNO openly, like China, because we are members of this organization and the moment is not opportune to do such a thing. If we were to support it, then the question arises: What are we doing in the UNO? Why do we not leave it? Regardless of what we think about the UNO, and this we have expressed openly, even while we defended the gesture of Indonesia, **the political moments are not such that we should follow Indonesia, because this would be a major political gaffe.** However, the stand of China is correct, because it is outside the UNO.

Now, on the occasion of the visit to Peking of Subandrio, the Foreign Minister of Indonesia, Chou En-lai delivered a speech in which, amongst other things, he said, «another united nations organization in opposition to the former one can be created» and appealed for its creation. This is the idea which Chou En-lai launched while speaking about «the re-organization of the UNO», etc.

If we take this idea of the Chinese comrades from the propaganda angle, simply as pressure aimed at the Americans, to intimidate them, this has its effect. **But if we take it from the other angle, that this idea has not been launched only for the aims mentioned above, but in order to work in the direction of setting up this international organization, this is a rash, immature, ill-considered idea, and difficult to achieve. The creation of such an organization, or the idea of creating it, is very hazardous,**

and could damage the prestige of China's foreign policy. This idea, or this decision, has not been carefully weighed by the Chinese comrades, and has been taken under the impulse of existing circumstances.

To destroy the United Nations Organization which, regardless of what it is doing, has a great tradition, is not so easy as the Chinese think. Not all the states which are in the UNO conceive the United Nations Organization as the Chinese and we do.

Then how have the Chinese comrades reckoned this question? Do they have in mind to create an international organization with China, Korea, Vietnam, Indonesia, and Laos? But then this would not be an international organization. The Chinese comrades may say, «We shall wait till others walk out, as Indonesia did, and then join us one after the other». This is not serious; you will have to wait a long time, and the idea will fall through, and you will be discredited.

The newly liberated countries, which are members of the UNO, are very unstable in their policy. Most of the leaders of these countries are under the influence of imperialists, some under the influence of revisionists, hence, to underrate the present influence of their policy and economic backing, means to display shortsightedness. Another international organization cannot be created in this situation. We see that the Arab countries and other states, with which we have friendly relations, are asking us not to insist in the enforcement of the rules of procedure in connection with the elections of the UNO organs, because then the question of the implementation of Article 19 of the Charter would erupt and the UNO «is done for», our friends say. And we, for the time being, hesitate lest we damage our friendship with them. With the idea they have launched, the Chinese are asking them to give up everything, even «their parentage»,

are demanding that they leave the UNO and set up a new organization.

The establishment of a new organization of the united nations is a titanic undertaking which, in my opinion, the Chinese comrades have not thought about deeply. They do not see that «their democratic friends» are raising all sorts of obstacles to the holding of a meeting of a political character, such as that of Asian and African countries, which is to be held in Algiers, are postponing it once, postponing it for a second time, because they have many contradictory interests, because they have links and interests with the Americans, the Soviets, the Titoites, with the devil and his son. Hence, to launch the idea of setting up a new international organization of states at the present time, in these conditions, not only is absurd, but also makes it hard to wage the struggle properly within this existing organization to get rid of the American and revisionist influence.

Today, the duty falls on us to fight the Americans and the revisionists both inside and outside the United Nations Organization. Continuing the pressure and hostility against the Americans and revisionists, we must use the example of Indonesia to increase the number of dissatisfied members and to discredit the American and revisionist policy. **UN decisions, simply as decisions of that organization, have little effect, however, the exposure of bad decisions, the anger of the members or groups of governments at the injustices of the big states, is much in the interest of and positive for the peoples.** We must work in this direction, and in these circumstances this is correct.

At present, there are «contradictions» between the United States of America and the Soviet revisionists over defraying the expenditure for the UN troops in the Congo. The Moscow revisionists want to pay, but if they do, they lose politically, because this once again proves

their armed intervention in the Congo. The Soviet revisionists are playing coy, the Americans are exerting pressure. Indirectly, the Soviet revisionists, too, are using the withdrawal of Indonesia from the UNO and will not fail to employ «Chou-En-lai's idea» directly to frighten the Americans and to get their share of concessions in the haggling in the bazaar of the United Nations.

Therefore, from the tactical angle, too, the idea of setting up a new organization should not have been launched so rashly by Chou En-lai. The Chinese comrades have neither informed us, nor consulted us on this question. We consider this a grave failure and error on their part. On the one hand, in the United Nations we raise the question of the expulsion of Chiang Kai-shek and the admission of People's China, and on the other hand, China seeks to create a new international organization. This is not a serious stand either towards us, or towards the other states friendly to China, which are fighting for it to take its proper place.

Hence, I think, China's idea will not have any success in this situation and may do us harm.

SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 21, 1964

THE DEFEAT OF CHOU EN-LAI IN MOSCOW

Chou En-lai went to Moscow like Napoleon and returned like Napoleon. He suffered an ignominious defeat. I feel very sorry for the great Communist Party of China and the fraternal Chinese people that are being discredited by a person such as Chou En-lai. The revisionists of Moscow provoked him, discredited him and humiliated him. If it were just a matter of Chou En-lai, who ha6 opportunist and capitulationist views, I would say: «Serve him right», but this is not a subjective matter. This is a matter of the Communist Party of China and what it represents in the international communist movement.

From a number of reliable sources, we are hearing what occurred in Moscow with the delegations of China, Korea and Vietnam, which had gone «to celebrate» the great anniversary of the Revolution with the «Soviet brothers» and «to assist the Soviet comrades». It is said that these delegations were humiliated by the Soviet revisionists.

Only Kosygin, quite alone, reluctantly received the delegation from Vietnam, having previously warned it that he could spare it no more than one hour. Kosygin received it coldly and disdainfully, listed the aid which the Soviets had given Vietnam, and then criticized them because their papers published anti-Soviet materials. In regard to the

question of Khrushchev, he barely mentioned it and said that the Soviets were not changing their line one iota.

The same arrogant and humiliating behaviour with the Korean delegation, too, indeed with it he cut down the time of the meeting, because the Vietnamese had taken up fifteen minutes more than Mr. Kosygin had deigned to reserve for them.

Meanwhile the Chinese comrades had four meetings with the Soviets and came away shaven and shorn. The Soviets received them very coldly, and told them: «Don't think that we are going to change our line, which was not built up by Khrushchev alone»; «we are going to implement our line unwaveringly to the end»; «we are not altering our attitude towards you, and this is not the attitude of Khrushchev only, but this is our unalterable line»; «you Chinese must correct your mistakes». Apart from this, from what we hear, the Soviets went even further. **Malinovsky said to Chou En-lai: «We overthrew Khrushchev, why do you stick to that old galosh, Mao Tsetung?».** Chou En-lai did not reply, but later invited Brezhnev, Kosygin, Mikoyan to a banquet, and said to them: «Malinovsky provoked me, is this what you think, too?». Mikoyan replied to Chou that Malinovsky had made a mistake. (Mikoyan said the same thing when the Vietnamese told him that Malinovsky had spoken against Albania.) Brezhnev «explained» to Chou that Malinovsky had allegedly been drunk and must make a «self-criticism». Chou En-lai informed these gentlemen, «I shall report this matter to Mao Tsetung».

The Soviets demanded from Chou En-lai that they cease the polemic, and he did not promise them anything. Malinovsky also offended Marshal Ho Lu by saying to him: «Why have you not come in your old suit, since you pretend you are modest, but have put on this suit of such excellent stuff?».

What a disgrace for the Chinese!!! All their «profound judgements», their «mature decisions», «the Marxist-Leninist line studied in detail in the Central Committee after the fall of Khrushchev», their indescribable enthusiasm, all suffered fiasco, all turned out to be wrong, incorrect, all proved to be childish ideas and the acme of opportunism, but they are so opportunist, so stuck-up, that without the slightest shame they insulted the Party of Labour of Albania and Albania.

Now what will they do about the Party of Labour of Albania? Will they recognize their terrible mistakes? They did not deign to give us any answer, be it a formal one about whether or not they retracted their request to Chervonenko about inviting Albania to go to Moscow, according to Chou En-lai's order.

The Chinese are not saying one word to our ambassador in Peking about the talks they held in Moscow, though it is their duty to do this, but what can they say? They are, excuse the expression, ... Perhaps they have assigned this «Marxist-Leninist» duty to their delegation which is supposed to come to our celebration, a delegation about which they have still not informed us, at least to observe protocol, that they accept the invitation! But all this is Chinese to us.

Yesterday the old tactics commenced or rather recommenced. «Hong qi» (Red Flag) published an article entitled «Why Khrushchev Fell?». The theses of the article are diametrically opposed to what Chou En-lai expounded before he left for Moscow. However, they are still subjective. The Soviets offended the Chinese, who became angry, so that what they decided fifteen days ago with so much clamour, up to the «withdrawal from circulation of all their articles which spoke about Khrushchev», they revoked today. Apparently, the armistice trumpeted by Chou En-lai was only for two weeks.

But we have no information from the Chinese, nothing is certain. What they say today they change tomorrow. However, in all their current debates, in all their discussions and the decisions they take, the correct stands of the Party of the Labour of Albania, which they regarded with such filthy scorn, hang like a spectre over their rubber judgements. They will pretend to make self-criticism towards us. The article about Khrushchev implies that they are trying «to please us», but we shall be vigilant like Leninists. We shall rejoice and it will be a victory for Marxism-Leninism if they acknowledge their mistakes, if their mistakes have become lessons to them to be correct and prudent in the future. We shall see.

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 23, 1964

PEKING'S REACTION AFTER CHOU EN-LAI'S RETURN FROM MOSCOW

Chou En-lai's return from Moscow empty-handed made the Chinese comrades throw all their beautiful hopes about the «Soviet comrades» in the Yangtse. Naturally, they changed the record, and this, of course, after the discussions they held during the meetings at which Chou En-lai made his report, and they reversed their previous «wise», «far-sighted decisions» «to assist the Soviet comrades», and returned to attacks on the «Soviet comrades». The armistice trumpeted so loudly, with such enthusiasm and confidence by Chou En-lai did not last more than two weeks.

The Chinese comrades, offended and angered by the insulting attitude of the Soviets who made them no concession in line or anything else, began with the old tactic, which we had foreseen. In «Renmin Ribao» they began to publish all the articles of the recent number of the organ «For A Lasting Peace...», which attacked China. Then not only «Renmin Ribao», which has a large circulation, but also «Hong qi» published the article «Why Khrushchev Fell?». The following day, in «Renmin Ribao» they published long summaries of various articles from the central newspapers of fraternal parties which take the Marxist-Leninist stand. They also published parts of our article of 1st November.*

---

* See: Enver Hoxha, «Speeches and Articles, 1964-1965», p. 317, Alb. ed.

The article in «Hong qi» was good. It was written under two pressures: from anger against «the Soviet comrades», and especially, from the desire to show us Albanians, who do not violate the principles of Marxism-Leninism and do not change the general line, that «we Chinese, too, are in good positions».

The article referred to was nothing but an exposition, in eight or nine points, of the things we said in our Memorandum, which we handed to the Chinese that day when Chou En-lai set out like a «victor» for Moscow. Indeed, some of our phrases were quoted directly in this article to imply that «both we and you are of the same opinion». However, in this article the question of the borders with the Soviet Union, Mao's interview with the Japanese socialists, had been reduced to a «border incident», or «Soviet border provocation in Sinkiang». But in the same article, and precisely at the point where it said that the Soviets «attacked a sister party and a fraternal people...» and other well-known formulae, they did not mention that this «sister party and fraternal people» were attacked because they defended Marxism-Leninism. However, they did not forget this when they were referring to their party.

Nevertheless, for us who know how matters stand in fact, this is a turn of one hundred-eighty degrees, or a pirouette. What they thought and said yesterday, they do not think and say today, at least on paper.

For us and international communism, this is a success, a good thing. It is very good that the Chinese comrades were not given the opportunity to sink more deeply into errors, and for this we have to thank the «Soviet comrades». The enemy is fighting us, but with its fight it is also helping us. If the Soviet revisionists had shown themselves more subtle, more diplomatic, the Chinese would have fallen into even greater errors.

What ferocious and determined enemies are the Soviet revisionists in whom the Chinese comrades had such great hopes! Not only did they not show themselves pliant towards Chou En-lai, but they even attacked and provoked him, at a time when they certainly knew the aims of the Chinese which Chou En-lai had expressed openly to the Rumanian and Cuban ambassadors and, possibly, even directly to ambassador Chervonenko. In other words, the Soviet revisionists told the Chinese: «No, we do not want you to help us. If you like, come over to our line, abandon your mistaken line, overthrow Mao», etc.

And in confirmation of their resolute stand and total opposition to the Chinese line and «Chinese assistance», as soon as Chou En-lai boarded his aircraft, a massive delegation to the Soviet revisionists, consisting of 92 Americans, including the biggest bankers and businessmen, arrived in Moscow. All these were given a sensational welcome by Mikoyan, Kosygin and other Soviet leaders. They held many open and private meetings (TASS reports this), and talked cordially about the further development of economic relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, etc.

Naturally, this means an even more thorough pursuit, on the part of the Soviet revisionists, of the treacherous course of Nikita Khrushchev without Khrushchev. This was completely clear to us.

But was this development clear to the Chinese comrades? I doubt this, because their views are not crystallized, not stable, otherwise they could not fail to have unity of thought and action in the Chinese leadership. It has been proved that the Chinese comrades alter their principles on account of fortuitous signs or the tactics of the enemy, and do not try to find a counter-tactic to the tactics of the enemy (which is another thing, but even in this case, within

tactics there are principles which must be respected and must guide the new tactic).

The Chinese have not said even one word to us. How could they face us to tell us this? But Marxists are not afraid to acknowledge their mistakes. Though they say this, the Chinese comrades do not do this because they do not like it.

I have strong doubts whether the Chinese consider their going to Moscow a defeat. Even to us, who know what aims impelled them to go to Moscow, when they tell us (because they will tell us something eventually), the Chinese will not fail to stress, «We went for the Soviet people, for friendship with the Soviet people, to tell them and the Soviet revolutionaries, China is with them, with the October Revolution», etc., etc. The Chinese comrades will not forget to stress that Chou En-lai did not applaud this or that part of Brezhnev's speech, and that this made a great impression at the meeting and among the people (because it was shown on television). Hence, they will say, «This is a great and incalculable success»!

Finally, the Chinese comrades will point out to us, «We did well to go to Moscow, because we felt the pulse of the new Soviet leaders, saw more clearly what aims they have, and were convinced that they are bad revisionists», etc., etc.

Well, well, they had foreseen all the eventualities, even if what resulted from the steps they were taking turned out to be a «girl» or a «boy». It is important for the Chinese, for us, and for the whole international communist movement, that the Chinese comrades reflect thoroughly on the mistakes they are making, turn these into lessons, and do not allow such things in the future. This is very important. The first thing in recognition of mistakes on their part must be an open stand towards

us. The circumstances, and Marxist-Leninist justice demand this.

They have to understand that we are not deceived with «formulations» and «catalogues of references». We are Marxist-Leninists and will always behave as such. We demand the same thing also from our comrades.

TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 24, 1964

A VERBAL COMMUNICATION OF THE CHINESE AMBASSADOR IN TIRANA ABOUT CHOU EN-LAI'S TALKS IN MOSCOW

On the instructions of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, the Chinese ambassador in Tirana communicated to us verbally about Chou En-lai's talks in Moscow. These things we knew, but they listed them point by point. The Soviets have offended them badly and have not made the slightest concession. The Chinese are very angry and «express their implacable opposition» to the Soviet revisionists. They have almost (in their views) copied word for word our opinions, expressed in the communication we sent them about what our Central Committee thinks of the situation created after the fall of Khrushchev. Not the slightest sign of self-criticism (but they have thought that this communication of theirs which was a hundred and eighty degree turn might be considered a self-criticism).

They do not fail to describe their going to Moscow as «essential» and «necessary», and to give precisely those reasons which we had predicted. Let it be, this is very good, provided they stand by what they say and don't shift from principles. We will do our duty and try to exert a good influence on them.

In a word, the Chinese ambassador made things a bit easier for Li Hsien-nien who will come to the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the Liberation of our Homeland.

TUESDAY
DECEMBER 1, 1964

THE CHINESE COMRADES RETURN TO CORRECT POSITIONS IN THEIR ATTITUDE TOWARDS THE SOVIETS

This is a great victory for the international communist movement. We have hoped that, even from the mistakes of the enemies our friends would correct themselves and not deviate too far. With their arrogant, insulting, treacherous attitude, the Soviet revisionists assisted us, they made the Chinese comrades lose all hope and return to the correct course, and avoided the danger which came from a mistaken tactic which they adopted with unreasoning enthusiasm.

Their article, «Why Khrushchev Fell?» put matters in order, notwithstanding that the new Soviet leadership is not mentioned there. In my opinion, the article was good, correct. In this way, the Communist Party of China stopped any misunderstanding which had begun to be created in the world through the Chinese delegation's going to Moscow. Although we knew what vain hopes impelled those who went to Moscow, still doubts were raised in the minds of the communists in the world.

It was clear that we were opposed to the Chinese comrades' going to Moscow for the celebration of the October Revolution. They owed the Soviets a return visit by

a Chinese «Grishin» (**1**), but even in this case they should have waited for the Soviets to invite them and not invite themselves. However, they not only sent Chou En-lai, but went even further, especially with us. We did not oppose the Chinese comrades' feeling the pulse of the Soviets after the fall of Khrushchev, but this work should have been done patiently, with dignity and not with such «confidence and enthusiasm» as they displayed.

However, the Chinese comrades saw what the Soviet leaders were, and also judged how well-considered the opinions of our Political Bureau were. We are not conceited about this and must not become so, because otherwise there is a danger that we shall make mistakes. We must always behave as Leninists and must never be haughty, vengeful, or petty-minded.

During this period the Chinese comrades are doing their utmost to point out the great value of the Party of Labour of Albania, the heroism of our people, the correctness of our line, and the unity which links our two parties and peoples. This is Marxist-Leninist on their part, and this, I think, is being done from correct standpoints, because the Chinese comrades saw, once again, that the criticisms and observations which our Party made were inspired by a correct and principled concern.

All the members of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of China, with the exception of Mao, went to the dinner which our ambassador in Peking gave. This is a sign of great affection and solidarity. We are overjoyed at this. Chou En-lai's speech was good, warm, and friendly. Likewise, the speech of Lu Ting-yi. There were

---

1 V. V. Grishin, at that time President of the General Council of Trade Unions of the SU, who headed the delegation of the CP of the SU and Soviet Government in the celebrations for the 15th anniversary of the proclamation of the PR of China.

many magnificent and ardent manifestations in Peking and in China in general on the occasion of the 20th anniversary of the Liberation of our Homeland. Li Hsien-nien, also, is showing cordiality, affection and warmth for us here, and speaking enthusiastically about our unity. This has great importance for us and for them. This has been our greatest worry during this period, and I am very happy that matters have been put on a correct Marxist-Leninist course.

It is our duty and we shall work with all our strength for this, to see that all the work, all matters, proceed on a correct Marxist-Leninist course, and that the unity of our two parties and countries is constantly strengthened on the Marxist-Leninist course.

1965

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 2, 1965

A RIGID POLICY OF ISOLATION OF THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT

It seems to me that the policy of the Chinese Government does not show the necessary dynamism and breadth of view, which the moments, the circumstances, and China's potential and importance in the international arena require. It appears sluggish, somewhat hesitant, isolated, and limited to certain given fields and specific problems. This policy lacks that initiative and regionalization which a great socialist power should have in the development of world events. Most of the time events burst upon it and it is unable to foresee or avoid them, to act in advance, to change, or halt their course of development, when these events are to the detriment of socialism and world peace. We cannot say that the Chinese policy does not react, does not take a stand, does not influence events, or the development and solution of them, but this policy acts with delay, not to the extent it should and when it should.

The struggle against American imperialism and the exposure of it on the part of China is done well, but in fits and starts, and the impact of its struggle is not felt everywhere as much as it should be. We can say that it is felt in the Far East, in the Indochina Peninsula, around Taiwan and Indonesia. The weight of China in this region cannot be ignored, either by the American imperialists or

by other reactionaries. China is assisting the peoples of this region in their anti-imperialist and anti-colonialist struggle, with its presence and support.

Such a method of struggle should be developed in all the regions of the world, even in some directions where the possibilities are more limited. China is obliged to re-examine its struggle against world imperialism from this broad viewpoint, because it is the only big socialist power in the world, which, on the basis of a correct Marxist line, must become the main support of the peoples who are fighting imperialism and modern revisionism.

The line of the struggle which China is following has been put forward correctly and is developing more or less correctly in Africa, Asia and Latin America. But I think that the Chinese underestimate, disdain, and have neglected the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism within Europe. This is because of various passing circumstances, which imperialism and modem revisionism have created and are still creating, to the detriment of socialism, which have grave consequences for the other continents where the revolution is seething, where the peoples are fighting, where the intrigues are major ones, and the situations unstable.

I am still of the opinion that the Chinese comrades see the struggle within Europe and the United States of America as remote, and wage it through a few good articles of exposure. But this, alone, is not and cannot be sufficient. The Chinese comrades do not study the concrete weaknesses of world capitalism in its own lair, do not go as deeply as they should into the circumstances created by the crises and disagreements. They are not actively exploiting the divisions among the enemy, are not flexible and swift in carrying out appropriate actions, which deepen the crises of capitalism and revisionism, in order to create such complicated situations for them that the effects of

the latter's aims and decisions are weak in the countries where the revolution and the uprising is developing. The Chinese comrades are not working to create situations in the lair of capitalism such as will activize the revolutionary forces, and make things easier for them, which, in my opinion, is very important for the revolution.

The whole of reaction attacks China, and this is an honour. But this does not mean that China, in return, should not attack reaction in every country. The Chinese attack, ours, and that of all the Marxists against world reaction are aimed at the mobilization of the people, the defence of their vital interests. Regardless of the fact that certain positive results have been achieved for the present, such as the establishment of diplomatic relations with some capitalist states, and the more or less normal development of trade with some other states like these, the defence of the interests of the peoples constitutes the fundamental issue of the struggle of Marxist-Leninists. We are not content with a few results achieved through our work with certain capitalist states, and on the other hand, these results must not restrain us in our struggle, in our strategy against the reaction of those countries. These results have been achieved precisely because, in the world today, as it is built and as it is being transformed in favour of the peoples and the revolution, the capitalists cannot act otherwise. In the existing situation, the capitalists want, strive, and never cease either their direct «hot» war, their clandestine struggle and subversion, or their ideological and political struggle in order to strike at us from outside and from within, if they find divisions in our ranks. In this case, we have to fight them a hundred times, a thousand times, harder than they fight us, with all our means and all the time, without let-up.

The imperialists of every description and the modern revisionists are always in feverish activity everywhere, in

all corners of the world. Up to a point, the Chinese are sitting as onlookers, while the enemies form and dissolve alliances, hatch up plots, attack, kill, arm, disarm, provide «credits» on heavy conditions, exert blackmail by suspending credits, replace one another in the «pastures», etc., etc.

And when the Chinese take some initiative, like that of «forming another UNO», they do this without considering deeply what it will lead to, and what results it will have.

I think they do not study all the circumstances thoroughly, are not fully in favour of examining events on a world scale, their view remains within narrow bounds, they hesitate to act correctly, firmly and at the right time, when the situations present themselves, or when these situations should be created.

But even in the context of Asia, where China as a socialist country, proceeding from sound Marxist-Leninist positions, can and must play a major role with the Japanese (I am speaking of relations with the Japanese Government), we see stagnation, an inactive policy, only a few meetings, a few political stands with the Japanese socialists and some political statements. Diplomatic relations between them are still not being established, and neither are they carrying on active and well-publicized trade, which would cause the Americans not only economic, but also political worries. I don't believe that the Japanese bourgeoisie wants to live forever under the Americans' yoke. Nor is it in the economic or political interests of Japan to have relations with Chiang Kai-shek and company and not with China. But if such a thing is not encouraged, naturally, the United States of America will continue to exert its influence on Japan, the Philippines, New Zealand, and elsewhere.

If we take as examples Pakistan, Afghanistan, Nepal, or Ceylon, with which China has normal friendly relations and trade, and perhaps gives them credits, again we do

not see that this policy of China's approaches to and friendship with these countries is having any obvious influence in our favour on the overall development of policy in these parts, that it is having repercussions, and that China is using the weight of its influence to bring about the failure of the imperialist and revisionist plans in these countries. Of course, I do not think that Ayub Khan, Ne Win, the King of Afghanistan, or the King of Nepal, will change course and fully accept the Chinese views on international problems, but in these countries we are not seeing any movement forward.

It seems to me that it is valuable not merely to go and make an official visit to those countries, or to provide some credit for them, but that it is also important to bring about the development of all forms of friendly relations, cultural, artistic manifestations, etc., with these states. I have the impression that not only are the Chinese comrades hesitating in this direction (they are afraid lest they are accused of aiming the domination of the world), but that they are not taking a proper view of the development, culture, and good, positive experience of others. I do not want to say that they are not concerning themselves about this, but they have shut themselves rather tightly within the framework of their own culture, and do not want anything good from the life, customs and positive experience of others in this field to penetrate into China. This narrow view in the national framework could lead the Chinese comrades into ways which are not good, and to a sectarianism or harmful isolation, a state of complete autarky. We see this not only in certain political stands of the Chinese comrades in the international arena, but also in some incorrect ideas of theirs in connection with world culture, including the repertoire of our songs, which have a sound people's character.

These views also lead the Chinese comrades into

underestimation of the activities of the capitalists, into inadequate appreciation of events, and failure to maintain the necessary stands at the proper time. This can lead and has led the Chinese comrades to the position that they compare world events with the events of their war against Chiang Kai-shek, and from this comparison they draw the conclusions on how they should act and define their tasks. In other words, their internal experience is everything, and they see the events in the world in this light. I find such a thing neither complete nor correct.

The internal experience one has lived through is a great treasure-store, but the experience of revolutions in the world, of victories and defeats of others is also a colossal thing which should be known and used. For Marxists, world experience is a broad field where they must carefully seek out the good things and learn from the bad things in order to avoid them. It is the custom of the Chinese comrades to tell others that they learn and profit from them, but I believe that, in fact, they do not value the experience and culture of others as much as they say.

The Chinese comrades speak against great-state nationalist views, but it seems to me that if the above-mentioned questions are not seen correctly in all their development, then such ideas as «mine is better than the others'» can open the way to mistakes of great-state chauvinism. For example, the Chinese comrades have eliminated all Soviet experience (we are referring to the good, positive, Leninist experience) from their life, and not only that, but on everything they point out that the Soviet experience «has not yielded good results» anywhere in China, «has ruined things», and therefore «is not suitable for China». This is neither correct nor internationalist. When the experience of the Bolsheviks of the time of Lenin

and Stalin is not valid, then what can be said about that of others?

However, without going any further on this, we can dwell on the question of the China-Korea-Vietnam-Albania meetings. We can say without reservation that, not only on ideological questions, but also on political stands towards events and concrete attitudes towards the actions of imperialists and revisionists, there is no joint consultation. Each maintains the stand he wants, when he wants and how he wants. The question here is not that one should take orders from the other, or that the policy of one should be subject to that of the other, but that such uncoordinated activity does not seem to me to be good.

The Chinese comrades avoid multilateral confrontations with us friends, do not want to hold meetings, even just to exchange opinions. Why? Of course they have their reasons, but it seems to me that in the final analysis they are not correct. They ought to carefully re-examine these stands, because they have repercussions in the international communist movement and will have in the future. Perhaps I am wrong in these judgements. Perhaps, being insufficiently informed, I am looking at these stands of the Chinese comrades from too narrow an angle, but I hope I am wrong, because this is less dangerous and less harmful.

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 3, 1965

OPPORTUNIST TACTIC OF THE CHINESE COMRADES

Our ambassador in Peking writes us about the talk which he had with Liu Hsiao and Yu Chang. According to them, and this is the line of the Chinese leadership, the revisionist clique in power at present in the Soviet Union is «meaner than Khrushchev, treacherous, cunning», etc., etc.; «Khrushchev was boisterous, while these operate in silence, and recently, have concluded many agreements with the Americans, which Khrushchev did not dare or was unable to do»; «on the surface, the present Soviet revisionists pretend to be good and moderate, but they are very bad»; «they put on masks to deceive you like the witch in the Chinese fable who put on a beautiful mask to attract young boys, and caught two, but the third tore off the mask and thus the real face of the witch was revealed», etc., etc.

But when our ambassador asked them: «Why don't you, too, attack the present Soviet leaders to tear the disguise from them?», they replied: «We (the Chinese) are replying to the Soviets through the articles of sister parties, and when the time comes that they (the Soviets) attack us (the Chinese) directly, then we shall rout them once and for all». **Hence, a «stern» fight with others' bullets.** And the Chinese, living on «borrowed flour», will deal the witch the «final blow» after the others have torn

the mask from her. **In a word, this means to build your reputation on the other's efforts.** This is truly revolting, neither Marxist nor honourable. But even more perfidious is the excuse they give for not continuing the struggle and the polemic against the Soviet revisionists. The Chinese comrades do not attack them «in order to avoid harming» the Soviet people, because according to them, if the Chinese attack them, then the Soviet leadership will tell the Soviet people: «Look at the Chinese, they are not letting us fight the imperialists properly. We (the Soviets) are fighting imperialism and they (the Chinese) attack us». In this way the Soviet people are embittered and will not understand us (the Chinese). That is why we are waiting for them (the Soviets) to attack us openly and then we shall strike them the final blow.

This is the «brilliant», «Marxist-Leninist» reasoning of these Chinese comrades, this is their «revolutionary» tactic!! This is scandalous. On the one hand, this means to do what the revisionists want (because they want this calm and have no reason to attack you openly), and on the other hand, if you pursue the logic of the Chinese tactic, according to which **you allow the Soviet people to become embittered towards the sister parties which tear the mask from the Soviet leaders**, such a thing has no importance for the Chinese. Here in Albania, the Ballists used to say, to justify their failure to participate in the fight against the occupiers, «The stew must be cooked without burning the pot». And that is what the Chinese think: Let others tear the mask from the revisionists, we shall take the credit for our wisdom, maturity, and cool-headedness in directing this work, and let the others pull the chestnuts out of the fire for us!

Unfortunately for them, they have reckoned their account without the host.

First, the Soviet people will not be embittered when

we expose the revisionist traitors. On the contrary they will rejoice, will be strengthened and assisted, and their love and respect for us will increase.

Second, we are not pulling the chestnuts out of the fire for the opportunists, but making our contribution to safeguarding the purity of Marxism-Leninism, regardless of whether we burn our hands. Let us burn our hands and our body in such a great cause! This is an honour, the greatest honour for us.

Third, the Chinese comrades are gravely mistaken when they think and act in this way. They will gain nothing from these speculations. The world will weigh you up and assess you for what you are worth and for what you have put on the scales. Time and mankind will find the correct weight of every word, every gesture, every deed of each party and people in specific situations, in separate actions and in collective actions.

SATURDAY
FEBRUARY 13, 1965

MAO TSETUNG TAKES A FIRM AND CORRECT STAND TOWARDS THE REVISIONIST KOSYGIN

From official reports which the Chinese comrades give in connection with the talks between Mao and Kosygin, when the latter returned from Hanoi, we observe with profound satisfaction that Mao has resolutely cut this dirty revisionist down to size.

Briefly, Kosygin demanded from Mao that the Chinese comrades should take part in the meeting of parties on the 1st of March, since they are even «changing its name», or that at least they should refrain from criticizing this meeting which, in fact, is a disruptive, revisionist meeting. He asked Mao to stop the polemic between them, or «at least not to make it bitter, but gentle»; Kosygin also asked him to say when the representatives of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union could meet those of the Communist Party of China for talks, and sought his opinion on when the meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties could be held. He also urged him not to support the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups that have been and are being created, etc.

As can be seen, Kosygin presented a number of demands to Mao, cunningly, with false humility. But Mao rejected them with irony and scorn.

Mao told Kosygin, «As for the meeting of the 1st of March, our comrades (Chou En-lai) have told you not

to hold it, while I tell you to hold it, without changing either the date or the name, and whatever you call it, and whenever you hold it, you will be exposed. We shall not go to that meeting, while as for the bilateral talks, the conditions are not ripe. You must openly acknowledge the mistakes you have made towards Albania, must also acknowledge a series of mistakes towards China», and these Mao listed to him one by one.

Kosygin replied to Mao that they (the Soviets) did not acknowledge and did not accept those things. Then Mao told him, «We (the Chinese) had set four to five years to prepare the meeting of the 81 communist and workers' parties, but now, apparently, this time has to be doubled, eight to ten years will be needed and, perhaps, even after that period, the matter must be considered again».

As to the polemic, he told him, it would go on for ten thousand years, because polemics never killed anyone, but simply cleared up problems. Kosygin told Mao, «If the polemic is bitter it will harm us», but Mao replied, «If it is not harsh it will have no effect, whereas it has to scald somebody and something.» Then Mao continued to tell Kosygin in ironical terms: «You are a 'Marxist-Leninist' party while we are 'dogmatists'. Then how can you propose to stop the polemic against 'dogmatists'; you expel from your 'Marxist-Leninist' parties the 'dogmatists', whom we shall defend and support even more strongly in the future».

When Kosygin spoke on the questions of «unity», Mao said to him: «You must admit your mistakes towards the Albanians, must retract the accusations you made against them at the 22nd Congress, must admit your mistake in breaking off diplomatic relations with them and put them in order». Kosygin replied to Mao by saying, «Now other circumstances have been created, and the new leadership has not accused the Albanians». But Mao told

him that such words meant nothing, because they had not admitted their mistakes towards the Albanians. Apart from this, and in connection with unity, Mao said to him: «You must retract your letter of the 14th of July 1963, and the anti-Chinese reports and decisions of the plenum of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union of February 1964; you must admit that the decisions of the 20th and 22nd Congresses are wrong, just as the struggle against the cult of the individual of Stalin and your idea about peaceful coexistence, about the state and the party of the whole people, about disarmament, and the solution to several other problems which are worrying mankind, are wrong. We are not in agreement with all these views,» continued Mao, «and as long as you do not change your stand there can be no unity between us. All you need do is admit that you have been wrong, and then,» Mao told him, «unity can be achieved. Therefore, first of all, admit that you have been wrong towards Albania and China.»

Mao went on to tell him: It seems to me, the enemies will compel us to unite after ten to fifteen, or after seven to eight years, when they aim their rifles and bayonets at us. Kosygin interrupted him, saying: «This means that we shall unite in war conditions». Mao replied: «You do not acknowledge your mistakes and continue in error, and, as it seems, you will learn from two kinds of teachers: from the peoples of the world and from the imperialists; indeed you will draw lessons from the imperialists' war, but only when you give up your mistakes».

Mao also spoke to Kosygin about the struggle that must be fought against imperialism, of which they (the Soviets) are afraid; about the peoples' national liberation wars, which they (the Soviets) do very little to help. On this question Kosygin interrupted and said: «I do not agree with such an assessment, because wherever there are revolutionary struggles, the Soviet Union gives them great

help». But Mao, with cold irony, continued his interrupted idea, saying, «Even when I say that you do very little to help them, I say this out of politeness».

This is a very good stand, firm and principled on Mao's part. The Soviets have been faced with heavy conditions, which they cannot surmount without breaking their necks.

The meeting of Kosygin with Mao assumes great importance for us, because Kosygin loses any illusions about overcoming the situation, without first losing his feathers and breaking his neck. On the other hand, in this talk Kosygin saw clearly that China and Albania are in complete unity. Indeed, as they tell us, Mao put our question and demands in the forefront. On this occasion, the Soviet revisionists also lost those illusions which might have arisen from the actions of Chou En-lai, which we know about. This talk will have repercussions later, in policy and ideology. In any case, this manly, Marxist-Leninist stand of Mao's pleases us. Such a stand is a victory for Marxism-Leninism and a defeat for the revisionists.

If we make an overall assessment of Kosygin's trip to the Far East we can reach the conclusion that he suffered a complete ideological and political fiasco there.

With the Chinese, too, he suffered ideological and political defeat. His wily demagogic manoeuvres received a heavy blow; his proposals were scornfully rejected. The Chinese are politically angry, because they have fully understood the true purposes of the Soviet revisionists after the latter's going to Vietnam and later to Korea. This has great importance.

Their going to Vietnam and the reception they were given there, such as it was, can hardly be considered sensational, although the revisionists will propagate it as such, however, the fact is that it was a Pyrrhic victory, a flash in the pan. Politically the Soviet revisionists were faced

with great difficulties from the actions of the partisans of South Vietnam and the barbarous provocations of the Americans against North Vietnam. Their «coexistence» and alliance with the United States of America suffered a shameful exposure. The real aims of the Soviet revisionists were not achieved at all. In regard to their «material and military aid», whether that given to North or to South Vietnam, time will show that it is fictitious and not only will future circumstances reduce that so-called aid, but it will become more clear that it is purely for propaganda purposes, a complete fraud and an investment to get their clutches on Vietnam.

In Korea, likewise, we believe that the Soviet revisionists' results will not be fundamental, will be only superficial. In this direction, judging from the reports of the Korean News Agency, I think there were paeans of praise for the Soviets from the Korean comrades, even more than from the Vietnamese comrades. But in the final analysis, Kosygin went especially to Vietnam, the situation in Vietnam is very different from that in Korea. Whereas the Koreans might have lowered their tone somewhat, although they may claim that what they said was directed to the Soviet Union, etc., etc. Well and good, we have said these things, too, and the Chinese as well, but we have said and say the other things, too. The Korean comrades have hesitated to say the other things, that is, to attack the Soviet revisionists, and therefore Kosygin is taking advantage of this, he is trying to find breaches, to give the Koreans aid in order to use it as a «gob-stopper», etc. In my opinion the Korean comrades should be more determined.

SATURDAY
FEBRUARY 27, 1965

THE CHINESE ARE PUBLISHING KHRUSHCHEV'S SPEECHES

The Chinese news agency reports that it is publishing the articles and speeches of Khrushchev (vol. 3), **which it describes as rubbish.** However, the publication of them in the Chinese press is not entirely without danger, because in that rubbish there is demagogy, which might fool people. If it does not expose and comment on them (and not just with 9 articles), such a thing could do harm. In some things the Chinese are astonishing.

The Chinese comrades are giving the usual signals as if they are going to write against the March 1 meeting. This will be very good. We are waiting for such a thing, because four months have gone by and up to now they have written only one article.

MONDAY
MARCH 1, 1965

THE MODERN REVISIONISTS ARE MAKING DEMAGOGY ABOUT THE «ANTI-IMPERIALIST COMMON FRONT»

The new Kosygin government is trying to set up a new demagogic tactic to hide its concrete actions aimed at the rapprochement of its policy with that of the imperialist bourgeoisie on the basis of the famous «peaceful coexistence».

It must be said that the new Soviet revisionist leaders have understood the great loss which the rapid progress down the road of betrayal brought the revisionists when Khrushchev was at their head. They had great hopes in the chiefs of American imperialism, they made them sensational concessions and reaped defeat for themselves.

With Khrushchev at the head, the modern revisionists had got themselves into a terrible jam which was squeezing them tighter and tighter each day. But that was not all. The rapidity of their descent was such that the new revisionists had to display great courage to restrain it, otherwise they would have been reduced to a stinking carcass under the imperialist heel. Therefore, Khrushchev's departure from the scene had become a condition *sine qua non* for them, even taking into account the great political loss they would suffer.

On the other hand, however, we should not underestimate the fact that in this operation which they carried

out, they showed themselves to be neither cowards nor fools. They showed themselves not to be cowards, because the removal of Khrushchev could not have failed to give rise to open and hidden opposition in their ranks, plus the opposition on many other issues from the Marxist-Leninists and the Soviet people themselves. This they coped with, one may say, through a manoeuvre that no ass could have conceived. Resolute Khrushchevites themselves, they did not expose Khrushchev openly, because his line, a line which they had worked out together, was to be followed in the future. Internally they criticized Khrushchev a little, but outside not at all, and thus they escaped exposing themselves, saved their line, avoided any opposition over principle with the personal supporters of Khrushchev and the «opposition» of the latter, if we can call it opposition, was confined to a subjective-sentimental issue, which time will scar over.

But the Khrushchevite revisionists who brought down Khrushchev had to think seriously about a tactical reshuffle in order to pull themselves together, to continue the line, and avoid the blows from the Marxist-Leninists. Our opposition to the modern revisionists is deep and insurmountable on all questions. Nikita Khrushchev and his associates tried to take us in, to impose their traitor views on us. However, they failed and were obliged to enter into frontal struggle with us on all questions. Here, too, they lost the battles one after another, their fortresses were destroyed. Then Khrushchev and company tried to have the polemic stopped, or rather, appealed to us to stop it, while they continued their treacherous course in peace. Here, too, they suffered defeat.

After the fall of Khrushchev, his associates who remained in power did not indulge in bombastic attempts like Khrushchev, or in beating their breasts and proclaiming that the polemics must cease, but, without forgetting to

call for this in a low voice, it seems, they have adopted the tactical line of seeking the cessation of the polemic, not by shouting for it, but by finding that field in the general line of their opponents where their demagogy could take root so that the polemic automatically fades out. And on this question they have found a field of action in foreign policy, or the «anti-imperialist front».

In this field the revisionists intend to carry on their demagogy about the fading out of the polemic, to continue with the development of trade, and, as far as conditions allow, even with official cultural exchanges. But the question of the «anti-imperialist front» is the primary field of their experiment. The Khrushchevite revisionists are fully aware of the views which the Chinese have expressed many times on this problem, indeed expressed very openly, in saying, «We must create an anti-imperialist front including even the revisionists». When the Chinese expressed this idea to us, we opposed the participation of revisionists in this front, but undoubtedly, they should have put this forward and reached agreement on it with the Communist Party of Japan, and some other parties of Asia.

Now the Soviet revisionists are not only proposing to them to co-operate, but are also taking practical steps. (When Kosygin went to Vietnam he asked the Chinese to make a joint declaration against imperialism.)

What actions are they undertaking?

1 — The good, fruitful Soviet-American collaboration continues, but without a fuss, without speeches and hosannas, not in Khrushchev style. They are signing agreements, reaching an understanding in the UNO that it should not carry on with its business. The United States of America continues what it has been doing in the Congo and elsewhere, undisturbed. The Americans bomb the Democratic

Republic of Vietnam, and Kosygin makes a speech just to appear on the record, while he takes the first step of the new demagogic tactic, the real tactic of their famous «coexistence».

2 — «In broad outline», say the Soviets, «we are against American imperialism». The revisionist Soviet newspapers at present are speaking «against American imperialism» and not only against «the madmen», but also against the «Johnson government», and no longer write about the «reasonable American doves», etc.

3 — In international meetings, their foremost line is the «anti-imperialist stand», perhaps not in a voice as loud as ours and that of the Chinese, but thereabouts.

4 — Even if the Chinese are not in accord with them in these meetings, the demagogy of the Soviet revisionists is having its effect: the Chinese are hesitating, do not engage in polemics, and if even they do so indirectly, the revisionists are not taking it up, not rising to the challenge, but keeping quiet and implying, «See, we are for the 'anti-imperialist front', we are speaking against the Americans, like the Chinese, but they are not satisfied, do not understand us and attack us. They (the Chinese) are not for this front, but nevertheless, we (the Soviets) are keeping quiet, we are and will continue to be patient». They say this once and repeat it five times over, and in this way, the revisionists think they can achieve the cessation of the polemic in such an important direction. We must grasp this link of the chain, they think, in order to grasp the others that come after this. With this move the revisionists hope to kill not two, but three birds with one stone: to continue their line of rapprochement with the Americans, to bag the Chinese, and to blackmail the Americans, and thus, within a relatively short time, their policy will become predominant and they will gain the time and the prestige they have lost.

We must expose this demagogy unceasingly every day, because even if the Chinese comrades see and understand these tricks of the Soviet revisionists, the revisionists of some countries around China do not see them, or do not want to see them, and to fight them as they should. They think that efforts must be made «to bring» the Khrushchevite revisionists «into line». Hence, both sides think that the two extremes can easily be brought to terms, whereas the Soviets, on their part, reckon that they can bag «these friends».

I am afraid that «these friends» are holding back the Chinese. The latter, prompted either by their wide-ranging, long-term policy, or by their wanting (quite correctly) to preserve their unity and alliance with the neighbouring peoples and the fraternal parties (which is essential), might make concessions in their tactics, and if they are not vigilant, they might compromise the principled line.

I am not sure, but although the Korean comrades say that we are right and say that they agree with us (on the quiet), still they waver, carry on their own policy of self-isolation. The Vietnamese are different, although some of them have great vacillations, but at least the waverers express their stands openly and the determined likewise.

However, time, the facts, will soon expose the modern revisionists. The American imperialists have to go ahead with their aggressive activity and will not accept the tactic of the Soviet revisionists for long. The Americans will continue their provocations in North Vietnam, their dirty war in South Vietnam, the extension of conflicts in other parts of the world where they have interfered, and thus, not only will their certain defeats make them more ferocious, but with their activities they will expose the Soviet revisionists, too.

For example, they will certainly bring about the failure of the Soviet-French proposal about an alleged settle-

merit of the question of Vietnam. The Americans will compromise the Khrushchevite revisionists more thoroughly by involving them in the dirty work which the imperialist bourgeoisie is setting up for them. This will occur because, in fact, the Soviet policy is deep in a quagmire, it is between two fires, and its stands are formulated on the basis of temporary developments advanced by the imperialist bourgeoisie, according to its own situation, views and interests. Since the essence of the Soviet policy is revisionist, it can follow no other course with its bourgeois allies than the maintenance of certain demagogic forms and disguises.

Our allies will see how correctly we present this question and how right is our struggle, which we wage not with kid-gloves, but with iron fists aimed at the enemies' head. The serpent must be struck on the head. These traitors must be exposed openly, by name, because nothing will be done, nothing will be gained continuing to use the phrases: «some say», «certain people do», apart from thinking that this is being diplomatic and showing oneself to be a diplomat, while in fact this is «ostrich diplomacy».

SATURDAY
MARCH 13, 1965

RESTRAINT EXERTED ON CHINA TOWARDS THE ACTIVITIES OF THE KHRUSHCHEVITES

From the events which are taking place and the various stands which are being maintained towards these events, I have formed the impression that restraining pressures are being exerted on China's policy by our friends, especially by the Koreans, the Indonesians, and possibly also by the New Zealanders and some other party.

To some degree, these restraining pressures are influencing the stands of China, perhaps not in essence, in principles, but in tactics, in restraining rapid reaction, especially towards the activities of the Khrushchevites.

The impression which we had earlier about the Korean comrades, that not only are they not resolute in the struggle against the modern revisionists but that Kosygin's visit weakened this struggle even more, is being strengthened. We must not be surprised if the Soviets and the Koreans have reached some sort of agreement to avoid fanning up the polemic between themselves, and the Koreans have accepted that style of harmless «polemic», which the Soviet revisionists advocate.

Pronounced conceit has overwhelmed some Korean leaders and they are practising a kind of «Monroe doctrine», i.e., self-isolation in regard to the struggle in defence of Marxism-Leninism. They pose as being with China, but in fact they are not in agreement with it. On such an

important question as the anti-revisionist struggle, they pose as being, and want to stress that they are, «independent in their thinking, actions and decisions», but in fact they lean more to a centrist opportunist position, which in reality is mostly to the advantage of the modern revisionists.

The Korean comrades, I think, have formulated a line of their own in regard to stands which must be maintained in the international arena and have decided on a special tactic towards China. Of course, the Korean tactic has great differences from that of China, but this tactic is not yet publicly clashing with that of the Chinese comrades, who are carefully avoiding this clash.

But how long things will continue this way cannot be foreseen. The fact is that when our struggle with the revisionists becomes acute and their exposure is done openly, thoroughly and continuously, the Koreans rush to make approaches to us to back the winning horse. Therefore, if we are to protect our allies from the infectious disease of modern revisionism, it is important that we strengthen our struggle against it, because in this way we also strengthen our allies and there are greater hopes of curing the infected. However, this centrist stand of the Koreans cannot but serve as a restraint on the Chinese, and the Soviets are well aware of this, but since it is impossible for them to hitch Korea to their chariot for the time being (and this will be difficult), they are also trying to use the Korean Workers' Party as a buffer party.

. . .

It seems to me that the Communist Party of Indonesia is like that unwieldy elephant which can hardly move. It is not making its presence felt, it is not playing

the role it ought to play and which is expected of it. It says that it is against the revisionists, but in fact is still marking time and continues the exchange of letters, beginning: «Dear comrades».

The struggle of the Communist Party of Indonesia is a furtive struggle, it shoots an occasional arrow at the revisionists and then «sends kisses» to the «dear comrades», whom it allows to operate in peace. Do you call this revolutionary struggle?!

Perhaps I am doing them an injustice but I think that the struggle of the Indonesian comrades is rather inspired by the «thoughts» and actions of Bung Karno. The Indonesian comrades say that they benefit greatly from the «understanding» of Soekarno, but isn't it true that the latter is benefiting from the «understanding of the Indonesian communists»?!

In any case they, too, are a restraint on the Chinese comrades, who, although they do not seem to be giving way on principles, in fact, are slowing down their actions, because they want to study them and to find that solution which will avoid the open emergence of their minor differences. I think this can be done, but within limits, because the struggle must not be ceased, weakened or slowed down in any way. These friends will be cured, and cured completely, if we fight hard and do no allow the brambles on our road to hold up our progress.

This is what the Party of Labour of Albania is going to do, Whether or not anyone likes it. Our actions will always be ceaseless, ever increasing, on the Marxist-Leninist road, and with a lofty revolutionary spirit.

MONDAY
DECEMBER 27, 1965

WE SHALL SUPPORT THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTIES

As a mark of international solidarity, we informed the Chinese comrades about the formation of the Communist Party of Poland, according to the facts which we had from the Polish Marxist-Leninist comrades. We did this also in case the Polish revisionist leadership might carry out some provocation. **The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China thanked us for the information and pointed out not only that it knew nothing about this event, about which it had not been informed by the Polish Marxist comrades, but also that it did not maintain secret links with them and did not help them apart from the open stand in its press about the struggle against revisionism.**

In other words, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China is telling us that it does not meddle in these matters. **It is evident that the Chinese comrades do not want the revisionists of the «socialist» countries of Europe to accuse them of interfering in their own internal affairs.** Such a stand on the part of China does not prevent the modern revisionists from accusing the Chinese of interfering in their affairs and describing the Marxist-Leninists of their countries as «sold out to the Chinese», and will not prevent them from doing so in the future, either. Likewise, this has not prevented the modern revisionists

from interfering illegally and plotting against our parties and countries.

We do not interfere in the internal affairs of any state, but when political and ideological aid is sought from us by the Marxist-Leninist comrades, we, on our part, with great prudence, have given this aid and will continue to do so. In the case of the Polish comrades it is they themselves who are struggling, taking decisions on their own. We do not meddle in their internal affairs, except that when they seek some advice from us we tell them our modest opinion; when their great cause has needed to be backed up and supported, this, too, we have done and will continue to do, and we think that we are not acting wrongly.

In every instance, the just struggle of the Marxist-Leninists against the revisionists of their own countries rejoices us immensely, and we are not in the least afraid to express our internationalist solidarity with them just because the revisionists will accuse us of «interference». We cannot take an icy stand towards the revolutionary actions of the Marxist-Leninist comrades.

We believe, and have always believed, that the arousing of the masses to revolution in the revisionist countries of Europe is indispensable and urgent. We know also that this work is being done in difficult conditions for our Marxist-Leninist comrades. In these countries there will be fascist terror against them, there is no doubt about that. But the work cannot be done otherwise, there is no other way: **either you accept the fight to the finish with the revisionist-fascist cliques, and consequently also accept great sacrifices, or you submit. For revolutionaries no other road is acceptable except the road of struggle.**

When you have created the conditions and have struggled to create these conditions, the primary necessity, the main subjective factor and the guarantee of success

in the revolution is the formation of the Marxist-Leninist party. No one else apart from the Marxist-Leninists of each particular country can judge whether the conditions for the creation of the Marxist-Leninist party are ripened. Every success and every defeat depends on the correct or incorrect judgment of the internal situations by the Marxist-Leninists, depends on their level of maturity and the degree of their revolutionization, depends on the general line which they adopt and which must be guided by Marxism-Leninism, depends, also, on the external factors and on the all-round internationalist aid of Marxist-Leninist parties which are in power or those which are not in power but take a firm Marxism-Leninist stand.

In connection with this aid, we present the question like this: The modern revisionists interfere wherever they find the possibility, in order to destroy, to bring down the Marxist-Leninist leaderships, to gobble up parties, peoples and states, and put them under their direction. In this matter, they make no distinction at all as to whether they are dealing with a socialist country or not, with a Marxist-Leninist party or a non-Marxist-Leninist party. They do not restrict themselves to propaganda alone. Any means is good enough for them. They conceal all this activity under demagogy, and first of all, under the slogan of «non-interference», while being up to their elbows in interference everywhere.

Should we act according to their tactic? In no way. Should we be afraid of what they will say about us, how they will slander us? In no way. We cannot sit idle while they continue their hostile work. We must expose them and counteract by dealing them blow for blow. One of the mortal blows to them, apart from those we deal them in the international arena with our stands and struggle, is the all-round support and aid which we must give all Marxist-Leninists without exception, wherever they are fighting.

1966

TUESDAY
AUGUST 9, 1966

THE CULT OF MAO TSETUNG

Marx condemned the cult of the individual as something sickening. The individual plays a role in history, sometimes indeed a very important one, but for us Marxists this role is a minor one compared with the role of the popular masses, which make history, carry out the revolution, and build socialism and communism. **For us Marxist-Leninists the role of the individual is a minor one also in comparison with the major role of the communist party, which stands at the head of the masses and leads them.**

However, we see with regret that in recent months, in regard to this question in particular, the Chinese comrades have set out on a wrong anti-Marxist course. **In reality they are turning the cult of Mao almost into a religion**, exalting him in a sickening way, without giving the least consideration to the great harm this is doing to the cause, not to mention the ridicule it gives rise to, because, in fact, such a great clamour is being made, with such high-falutin terms that all this seems to be contrived, is becoming an anachronism, impermissible for us Marxists and unacceptable for our time.

Mao has great merits for the Chinese revolution as well as for the construction of socialism in China. We have great respect for him as a Marxist, but we cannot reconcile ourselves to the propaganda campaign of the Chinese comrades in connection with his figure. We condemn

this unrestrained, abnormal, non-Marxist propaganda. The fact is that our criticism over this question, which we made to Chou En-lai, the last time he was here, had no effect at all, indeed, it seems to me that our comradely criticism must have been distasteful to the Chinese comrades. But nothing can shake us from our position of saying what is right and defending it.

What emerges from the Chinese propaganda on this question? «Mao is the sun that illuminates the world», «Mao is a great genius without comparison in the history of mankind», «the thoughts of Mao are the acme of Marxism», «Mao knows everything», «Mao has done everything», «if anyone wants to solve anything, at any time, in any country, let him read the works of Mao, let him be inspired by the ideas of Mao». These are some of the least exalted descriptions we can record, but in the Chinese press they are using such exalted expressions, speaking of such gestures and occurrences that one is impelled to think and ask: Are we dealing with Marxists or with religious fanatics? Because truly, from what we are seeing with our eyes and hearing with our ears, in China they are treating Mao as the Christians treat Christ. What is said about Mao by the Chinese or foreigners, by good people or flatterers, by ordinary people, sincere or hypocrites, all this is being raised to theory by the Chinese propaganda in a sickening chorus.

Wanting to bring out the merits of Mao, the Chinese comrades have obscured the role of the masses, obscured the role of their party, not to mention the role of their Central Committee, which simply «doesn't exist» in comparison with the personality of Mao. They have replaced Marxism-Leninism with «Mao Tsetung thought», indeed the Chinese propaganda gives the impression that it wants to say that Marx and Lenin are allegedly a hindrance to the

«fame of Mao», therefore they are being mentioned by name as little as possible. I believe I am not mistaken when I say that the Chinese propaganda is making every effort to inculcate in the people the idea that when one speaks and thinks about Marxism-Leninism one should have in mind «Mao Tsetung thought»; hence, according to this propaganda, «there is no need to refer to the teachings of Marxism-Leninism, but only to Mao Tsetung thought». How can such ideas be accepted as Marxist-Leninist judgements?!

The question arises: Why all this unrestrained propaganda? Whom does it benefit, and is it necessary to carry on such propaganda about a renowned personality like Mao Tsetung, whom not only the Chinese communists, but also those of other countries recognize? I cannot explain this otherwise than as the deafening beating of the drum which conceals some hostile work, either immediately or in the long term.

Nikita Khrushchev fabricated the question of «Stalin's cult of the individual» for his own treacherous purposes. He slandered and slandered him to such an extent that «something would stick» in people's minds. This lack of restraint of the Chinese propaganda about Mao is really fostering the Khrushchevite propaganda, although it creates the impression that it is opposed to it.

We Albanian communists, who are waging a stern struggle against modern revisionism, who have thoroughly understood the Khrushchevites' tactics and strategy, who are, in fact, the only ones defending the figure of Stalin properly and who have such great love for the Chinese comrades, Mao and the Chinese people, who are on the same line and on the same front with us, do not understand and do not accept this propaganda which is being made about Mao.

Then the question arises: How can such a thing be

understood and accepted by those communists throughout the world, still without much experience, whom we are trying to inspire correctly with our work? But why do the Chinese comrades allow such a thing to develop in this way?

As we see it, such unrestrained propaganda assumed proportions alarming to us Marxist-Leninists, especially after the Cultural Revolution began and the anti-party work of Peng Chen and his associates was disclosed. The Chinese comrades told us that this was a major plot against Mao Tsetung thought, that these modern revisionist plotters, agents of capitalism, wanted to take over the reins of the state, to overthrow the Central Committee and turn China into a revisionist capitalist country. These people were uncovered very late, but they were uncovered. This was a merit of the Communist Party of China, of Mao personally and his Marxist-Leninist ideas. This is correct, a strength, a fact which must be brought out and inspire the Chinese people and arm them with the quality of carrying things through to the end, for the benefit of socialism in China and Marxism-Leninism and communism in general.

In China there is talk about the dictatorship of the proletariat, about the class struggle, but, when it comes to what should be done with these major participants in this plot, such as Peng Chen and company, we do not see anything serious, Marxist-Leninist, being done. The main one, Peng Chen, has not even been named anywhere, he still remains a member of the Political Bureau of the Central Committee, just as before, together with Peng Teh-huai and a number of others. The other plotters have been removed from the posts they had, have been exposed, and have been made to wear the «dunce's cap» for their re-education. No trial is being held of these plotters who wanted to bury the regime and Mao.

Can it be that the modern revisionists who are still concealed, who now have drawn up their legs to cover their tracks, are inspiring this unrestrained propaganda of the cult of Mao with the intention of escaping today as «ardent Maoists», in order to fight better tomorrow against the party and Mao himself, as Khrushchev did against Marxism-Leninism, Stalin, the Soviet Union and international communism? We are thinking about this and suspect it may be so. As it seems, the Chinese comrades are not sensing such a danger.

The struggle for a proletarian culture and against bourgeois culture and its influence is something correct which must be carried out by all of us. But in this Cultural Revolution which is going on in China we observe certain things which make an impression. The main issue is that «proletarian culture begins and ends in China», «nothing else in the world is any good». For the Chinese propaganda, the positive and progressive aspects of human thought have no value at all, only the «ideas» of Mao Tse-tung and everything which comes from Chinese hands is of value! Such a spirit, and this is the direction in which things in China are heading, is not healthy and contains great dangers, just as the excessive persecution of the intellectuals there might have repercussions, which reminds us of the actions of the Yugoslavs and their agent Koçi Xoxe against intellectuals in our country in order allegedly to defend the «proletarian nucleus», as Koçi Xoxe put it.

The Chinese comrades who, in many things, show themselves «cautious», «slow to move», who have made «re-education» a principle, who have the theory of «a hundred flowers» and «a hundred schools», have now begun to attack things with big axes. We agree that the axe should fall where it is necessary and with great force, we agree that the broom, indeed a big broom, must be applied, but, as we see it, at least from the propaganda that

is coming out, the broom is sweeping away every work, every literary creation, regardless of the overall progressive spirit of the work, the time at which it was written, and the role it has played in those circumstances. While as for progressive world literature and progressive culture in general, for the Chinese comrades this has no value at all, it is barren country to them.

Perhaps I am mistaken, but all these things are not on the right road and damage our great cause. Marxism-Leninism does not permit us to treat these problems in this way, because later this leads us up the wrong path. You can make propaganda against chauvinism, but still you come out yourself on the road of chauvinism; you can speak about links with the masses but isolate yourself from the masses; you can speak about the unity of international communism but isolate, remove yourself from this unity; you can speak about creative thought but isolate yourself from the creative thought of international communism and the creative progressive thought of mankind.

I think that at present the Chinese comrades do not see these matters very clearly. Why? This is a big question mark. The problem of criticism and self-criticism, of purging the consciousness of communists of every petty-bourgeois remnant, is a capital issue for us, it is one of the greatest and most effective schools for the revolutionization of people, it is the best cure to fight the disease and save the patient. The greater the masses involved in this, the better, but if this is not well led it causes harm, because in the world, even in the ranks of communists, there are not a few who misuse this weapon to hide their own sins and to attack and denigrate others.

The educational work of the party, its check-up, leadership and advice, are absolutely necessary and salutary. But if this great complicated, difficult task, one of the most difficult, is left in the hands of students, to sponta-

neity, as I have the impression it is being done in China, this can bring great dangers. In that country at present the masses, and the students in particular, have been called on to play a major role. This is correct. But in such a delicate question the instructions and leadership of the party must be clear, unequivocal, not with zigzags in principles, and above all, the implementation of these principles must be controlled and guided as in a battle, as in a revolution, and not in anarchic forms.

Up till yesterday there was the slogan of «a hundred flowers» and «a hundred schools». How was it applied and what results did it yield? Was it understood correctly? Were there mistakes in its concept and application? This is not being said by the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Does the hostile activity of Peng Chen and company have its source in these directives?! Have they disguised themselves under this slogan? This is not being said. Perhaps the Chinese comrades have reached conclusions, and we know nothing about this. However, we see that the students in China have taken the bit between their teeth and are hitting out wherever they can, up to the point that the police have to intervene to calm things down and clear the ground. It seems to me that this is not correct.

To attack, to denounce, to call even progressive things reactionary, simply because they are old, and to do this at revolutionary and progressive moments for your people, for the history of your people, is very wrong.

To allow the students to attack and denounce all the old intellectuals and scientists without exception, this, too, is very wrong.

To allow the students to display a terrible xenophobia, as is being done in China, means to make a great mistake which has nothing at all to do with proletarian internationalism, means not knowing how to distinguish between

the peoples of the world and imperialism and world capitalism, between the progressive and the reactionary.

If the students are allowed to express their «passions» as they want and as is occurring in China, at least from what we learn from the news, this leads to rejection of the correct slogan of education and re-education, even including the Emperor of Manchukuo, Pu Yi, and its immediate replacement with the slogan: Come on, men, sweep away the lot! because nothing in the world matters, apart from the «thoughts of Lei Feng» (**1**). The thoughts of Lei Feng are being propagated as good and revolutionary, which must serve the education of people, but it must not be permitted that, because of these revolutionary principles which inspire the Lei Fengs, the progressive ideas of mankind, within China or outside it, should be tossed down the drain. **Progressive** culture and science have universal importance, and we, as communists, basing ourselves on our Marxist-Leninist science, which is universal, do not reject the progressive world culture and science of different peoples and countries.

The communists have permanent need for the purging of their consciousness, they need continuous tempering. Then what about the elderly, the non-party people, the old intellectuals? But does this mean that dangerous excesses should be permitted, as is occurring among the students in China?

As to whether there was a need for a great shake-up there, in my opinion, there was such a need, but the shake-up ought to be well-studied, organized, guided, and continuous and neither an earthquake, nor a flash in the pan.

I think the work for people's ideological education, for their political, scientific and cultural education, should not be done with intermittent campaigns but should be a per-

1 A Chinese soldier.

manent campaign, a well-studied permanent campaign, safeguarding principles, correcting the mistakes which will certainly be discovered, making the necessary tactical zigzags, and even making temporary concessions, if need be, in order to cope with a situation and to overcome the difficulties.

To begin a cultural revolution by attacking the revisionists, Peng Chen and company, without a clear document being issued by the Central Committee of the Party on how this revolution is to be carried out, seems to me not in order.

To solicit the opinion of five students on how the future school programs in China should be, seems to me not at all correct, regardless of whether these five, or a hundred, are inspired from above. This is formalism. The Central Committee must formulate and present the experience of the masses for discussion by all the working people, and then let the students give their opinion, even millions of them.

I base these ideas of mine about what is occurring in China at present on those materials which the Chinese press is publishing. Naturally, the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has its own decisions, its own more comprehensive tactics. Not knowing what these are, possibly I am wrong in my estimate of the situation in China. Time will make everything clear to us.

SATURDAY
AUGUST 20, 1966

WHAT IS GOING ON IN CHINA?

A great puzzle!! Astonishing events, dangerous to the great cause of communism, which worry us immensely, are taking place. We have a problem with many unknown factors to solve, we have to try to see clearly into this dark Chinese forest. With Marxist judgement and with the numerous, but at the same time very fragmentary data of the official Chinese press which we have, we shall try to arrive at certain guiding conclusions which are so necessary and essential to our Party, to our future stand.

I say that we must draw the necessary conclusions which will guide us, because our Party must have its own opinion, moreover a very clear opinion, about what is occurring in China. Our Party is a Marxist-Leninist party, and in no way will it allow itself to be caught up, even in the slightest, by subjective judgements, or go with the current, on the ground that the «officiai» line of the Communist Party of China is such and such, and we must show ourselves in solidarity with it, even when we are convinced that it is not on the Marxist-Leninist road, even if only one thing is still unclear. In this latter case it is our duty to clear things up, but we must be very prudent and very vigilant. We must be prudent without making any concession, until we can see clearly and reach con-

clusions about everything that has to do with this question.

In my analyses, not having the key data in my possession, and basing myself on those public documents which the Chinese comrades give us, I am also obliged to make suppositions, which I think are natural ones, drawn from an analysis of facts, even if these are not complete.

The problem began with the Proletarian Cultural Revolution against bourgeois elements in the field of culture, who had infiltrated the party and the state, and against bourgeois culture in all its aspects. In this direction this revolution had to be carried through to the end. This was a correct struggle, and we welcomed it, because for a long time our Party has fought, is fighting and will continue to fight precisely for this, and this is how all parties, which are really Marxist-Leninist, should act.

Of course, the methods to carry this revolution through to the end may differ, and likewise the tactics for carrying out this revolution, in connection with internal and external factors. But **such a very complicated, very delicate revolution must be inspired by the Marxist-Leninist ideology, must be organized and guided by the party**, and there must never be any smell of mysticism, metaphysics and idealism, either in its essence, its forms or its tactics, because then it is no longer a Proletarian Cultural Revolution, but its opposite, regardless of how it is advertized, and regardless of whether the masses hundreds of millions strong are set in motion.

In my opinion, this Cultural Revolution in China did not begin in the way a serious party, which has its feet on the ground, ought to have begun it. The army touched it off, then the Peking University, and later its flames spread everywhere. The Chinese propaganda presented this as a revolution launched from below, by the revolutionary masses, and said that it developed in a «sponta-

neous» way, but in reality it is organized. But by whom? We shall try to answer this later, because it is difficult to do so now. However, we must say that now emerges the figure of Lin Piao, the leader of the army, who has been sick for years on end and likewise for years on end, in practice, has been replaced by Lo Jui-tsin, an «enemy» and a member of the «black gang». Lin Piao comes out with an article which says, «Everyone should read and study the works of Mao Tsetung, and these must guide us». This article became the pivot and the banner of the Cultural Revolution and the struggle against the «black gang».

The question arises: How is it possible, and is it in order and Marxist-Leninist that for such a Cultural Revolution one person of the Political Bureau and the Central Committee, even if he is minister of defence, or the first secretary, or the chairman of the party himself, should become the standard-bearer, while the party and its Central Committee remain in the shade?! No, this is not in order, this is not Marxist-Leninist. Only the Central Committee of the Party can take such decisions and actions. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China did not issue the call for this Cultural Revolution, nor did it lead it. The call was issued by others, the revolution was developed in spontaneity and disorder, and this was called the «revolutionary method». Only now, several months after the beginning of the revolution has the Central Committee finally met (the 11th Plenum, after four years! Scandal!!) and issued a «set of rules» about how the Cultural Revolution should be carried out. What else did this Plenum of the Central Committee discuss? A great mystery. Later we shall make certain deductions from the mass meeting which was held a few days ago in Tien An Men Square, in which a million people of the Cultural Revolution took part.

Hence, from the manner in which this Cultural Revolution was launched, the public facts make one think that this method of action was imposed on the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, because it took decisions and came out with resolutions on how this revolution should be guided much later, several months after it broke out.

Why did it happen that way? Here lies the mystery, and for the moment this cannot be explained. It is a fact that since 1956, when the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China was held, more than five years have gone by since the time when its 9th Congress should have been summoned. Why is this? It is difficult to explain. Normally, each Marxist-Leninist party holds at least two plenums of the Central Committee a year. The recent plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China was held after four years' delay! Then who is leading the party? Is the congress leading it? Is the Central Committee leading it between congresses? It seems that these forums have been displaced from leadership. It seems that the Political Bureau of the CC or certain main individuals are leading. Do these individuals at least lead in a collective way, and do they adhere to the norms of the party, or do they have unlimited «authority» for everything, and decide the interval of time between congresses and plenums as they please? We cannot pronounce ourselves on this, but we see that enemies such as Peng Teh-huai and Peng Chen remain in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. Other comrades in the Political Bureau, in the Central Committee and outside it, have been doing a thousand and one things, which are now finally being revealed, and, on account of this, the Cultural Revolution begins against them. Their activity has been described as a great conspiracy intended to direct socialist China on to the revisionist

course, the capitalist course, and to replace the ideas of Mao Tsetung, etc. If this is such a conspiracy, if this conspiracy had been hatched up in the army and everywhere, this is no longer a «cultural», «ideological», conspiracy, but, first of all, a political conspiracy, intended to bring down the socialist regime.

The Chinese comrades are striving at all costs to avoid describing it in this way, as it is in reality. When I said to Chou En-lai, after his exposition (which was very general in connection with the participants in this conspiracy) that Peng Chen and company were agents of imperialism and the capitalists, he jumped up saying: «I have never described them in this way in the exposition I made to you».

From these things we can draw certain preliminary conclusions: since the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China meets once in four years, the Chinese leadership is not in order, it has violated the norms of the party, the norms of democratic centralism, the norms of collective leadership. The Political Bureau of the Central Committee has set aside the leading role of the Central Committee, has taken away its authority, and in the Political Bureau itself unrestricted individual leadership has prevailed, uncontrolled, or very weakly controlled, even by Mao Tsetung himself. The fact is that in this whole business of propagating Mao's ideas only his old writings are mentioned, and the quotations, too, are drawn from his old writings. There are no new ones.

Has Comrade Mao exercised effective leadership since the last congress in 1956, or has he just been asked «in passing» and only «given inspiration»? This we do not know concretely. But I suspect that, wittingly or unwittingly, such a method of work not on the Marxist course has left Mao on the sidelines and has turned him into a mere symbol. The work has gone on outside the party

rules, hence there must not have been unity of thought and action there. The enemies, careerists, factionists, and what have you, have taken advantage of this. **A number of capital ideological and political stands clearly indicate this unhealthy situation**, in the recording of which we are not mistaken because they are known:

1 — They were very late in commencing a resolute struggle against the modern revisionists. They did not defend our Party directly for a long time. Why? For tactical reasons? No. But because of ideological hesitations, vacillations. Of course, this major problem was not raised in the Central Committee, and hence the comrades of the Political Bureau reflected their vacillation in their stands, and whenever a decision for action was taken, it was only a lame one.

2 — Khrushchev fell and the Chinese comrades abruptly decided to go to Moscow to settle matters. (Chou En-lai's scandalous action towards us is known.)

3 — Their line of the «anti-imperialist front including even the modem revisionists». After six or seven months they abandoned this position and took the opposite position, the correct one.

4 — The Communist Party of Indonesia, which was hit so hard by reaction, was not defended at all by the Chinese press and propaganda, it was ignored. Why? This is a very serious problem.

All these things and many others make me conclude what I said earlier, that in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China there is no unity, no collective work, and the work in non-Marxist ways has weakened the party, weakened the Central Committee, and has permitted many evils, which were disguised with many excuses and happenings, but which developed and inevitably brought about a rotten state of affairs.

Even when this hostile work was discovered, the struggle against it was not waged, and is still not being waged, in the correct party way, in the Marxist-Leninist way. Therefore, this raises great doubts. Instead of being waged by the party, this struggle is being waged by the «revolutionary committees», which, as is known, are not controlled and led by the party, but everything is done and led in the name of the unrestrained cult of the individual of Mao Tsetung, the «works of Mao Tsetung», the «quotations of Mao Tsetung», up to «Mao Tsetung's swim».

Recently the name of the party has been completely overshadowed by the name of Mao Tsetung. «Mao Tsetung has done everything», «his ideas guide everything», the party exists thanks to these «ideas», «without Mao there is no party, no socialism». And all these terrible distortions (you only need to read Hsinhua to find them) are being made in Mao's presence. Mao approves them. Why? This is astonishing!

Even if we suppose the greatest evil, that the Communist Party of China «has totally degenerated», and that the authority of Mao alone is able to change the situation, still the course being followed is not Marxist-Leninist, it is a dangerous course. Even if we suppose that the Whole Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has degenerated and is in hostile positions, this course which is being followed there to stabilize the situation is not Marxist-Leninist, it is a dangerous course. Behind the fanaticization of the masses about the person of Mao Tsetung, as it is being exploited in China, there is something very dangerous and Mao is making a colossal mistake in failing to take stern measures about this.

Who has set up all this colossal work on this wrong and dangerous course with major consequences? The

plenum of the Central Committee which was held this month, and which, according to the communique issued, went on for twelve days, certainly discussed many problems, and from this discussion it unanimously approved the line of the Cultural Revolution and the mode of action which has been followed.

Apart from the communique in which, after Mao Tsetung, the figure of Lin Piao was brought out in a demonstrative way, a big meeting of a million people, in which Mao and the other leaders took part, was held in Tien An Men. A thing that especially struck the eye was Mao's military uniform, but not only that. The meeting, its orchestrated organization, the communiques about the meeting, about the participants on the tribune, the speeches that were delivered, and the photographs that were published in the papers, sought to demonstrate, and in fact affirmed, several main orientations of the plenum. It turns out that the main leaders of this revolution are Mao Tsetung, Lin Piao and Chou En-lai. Lin Piao delivered the main speech, praising Mao to the skies, and the latter stood and listened to all the praise. Chou En-lai, too, paraphrased Lin Piao, of course, boosted Mao and Lin Piao, and finally, according to Hsinhua, Chou En-lai, from the tribune, personally led the song for the masses in the square.

Apparently, on this occasion, too, Chou En-lai is officially playing the role of the conductor, as usual. Hence, it turns out that for years on end Chou En-lai has played the main role in the leadership after Mao. This gives rise to many doubts, because the stands of Chou En-lai towards us and towards the modern revisionists have been very dubious. In the Peking newspapers we see only the photograph of Mao, and this is normal, but then we see the photograph of Mao and Lin Piao, and on the other pages photographs of Mao, or his wife, with Chou En-lai.

This wife of Mao's appears before us in the political scene for the first time.

On the other hand, we see that the order of listing the leaders, an order which was a taboo for the Chinese, has now changed. After Chou En-lai, the director of the propaganda is ranked fourth, while Liu Shao-chi has moved from second place to eighth, and Chu Teh has been shifted from fourth to nearly last, and so on. If I am not mistaken, this indicates that there have been differences, factions, and debates in the Central Committee. Apart from the group of Peng Chen (who does not figure in the list), since changes have been made in the list, and the alteration of the list is the only recognized Chinese way of making the changes known, there have been others. But this method is equivocal. It means: interpret it this way or that way, as you choose; you can take it that Peng Chen has been removed from the Political Bureau; or that he has not been removed, whichever way you like.

But one thing is clear, namely, that Liu Shao-chi no longer remains in his former positions. Why? What does he think of all this? Is he right or wrong? Who is right or wrong in all this? This is the enigma which has to be solved. The enigma can and must be solved only by analysing the events and stands correctly and not subjectively.

There is no doubt that these stands, these measures which the Chinese are taking, will have a line which will be reflected in life and will enable us to judge them better and to prove whether we are reasoning correctly or whether our worries are groundless. I would like to be wrong in my analysis, but on the basis of these actions and knowing Chou En-lai, too, I am afraid that there may exist a strong group with him at the head, which is manoeuvring in non-Marxist ways and has managed to

deceive even Comrade Mao temporarily, by presenting the situations to him in a distorted light. Mao must not fall into such errors. It is possible that he is isolated from the work, and, since the situations are reported to him incorrectly, he has arrived at the conclusion that only in this way can the hostile work and groups be liquidated, the persons corrected and Marxist-Leninist unity established in the party.

I think that unity is achieved through revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist, party methods, but not by calling the exaggeration of the cult of Mao among the masses revolutionary, and through the buying of his works allegedly to read them and be guided by them.

The works of Mao should be read, should be studied, but in the way this is developing in China I think there is nine times more noise than work. What I am afraid of is **lest this noise is covering up some work which is being done on the quiet.** This will be a catastrophe. **The modern revisionists have all sorts of arrows which they use, both short range and long range.**

The fact is that in order to fight the Chinese comrades and to strengthen their own allegedly correct thesis against the «cult of Stalin», the Soviet and other modern revisionists need only reprint in their newspapers what the Chinese press is saying about Mao. But they are not raising this question. Why? Because it is to their advantage and on their line; if not today, tomorrow they could have the Chinese as their friends, though they appear to be acting in opposition to them on the «question of the cult», but, in reality, in their ideology and aims, they are in agreement. They are hiding themselves under the disguise of the struggle against modern revisionism, under noisy, bombastic «revolutionary» logans: «Let us fight for Marxism-Leninism, for the construction of socialism in China and in the world». Mao has great responsibilities. The

Communist Party of China and the genuine Chinese Marxist-Leninists have great national and international responsibilities. What occurred in the Soviet Union is a major lesson which must not be repeated elsewhere.

My hope is that with the masses of communists and the people reading and studying the ideas of Mao, irrespective of the wrong forms and methods that are being used, and especially their mystical and idealist spirit, these ideas will become a counter-weight dangerous to the disguised modern revisionists, whoever they may be. But the genuine communists, with Mao at the head, must be more vigilant, more active, more in the forefront of the work, to say «stop!» to the hostile activity, mercilessly fighting, not just with manifestations, but even with bullets to the head of the enemy, if this is necessary.

TUESDAY
AUGUST 23, 1966

IDEOLOGICAL DEVIATIONS

The deviations in the field of culture, against which the Cultural Revolution has burst out, are a reality, as the Chinese press and propaganda explain. The Chinese leadership has more or less defined the group in the main leadership responsible for these deviations. The most important figures in this group are Peng Chen and Lu Ting-yi.

The question arises: In the main leadership, are they alone responsible for such dangerous deviations? But the others, who for such a long time have not seen these deviations and have not taken measures against them, where have they been?

The deviations referred to cannot be simply «cultural». They are primarily ideological and political. This is a question of the whole «superstructure», as the Chinese propaganda explains. Thus, according to the Chinese propaganda, it emerges that within the Chinese leadership Peng Chen and Lu Ting-yi ran the whole policy and ideology. In my opinion this cannot be true. There are others in this, too.

But let us reason *par l'absurde*. Peng Chen and Lu Ting-yi are the only ones responsible for these cultural deviations. And these deviations in all their extent long escaped detection by the main leadership. But we cannot

accept that Peng Chen and Lu Ting-yi were the masterminds of the policy of the party and state. Of course, there were others. Then the question arises: Who is responsible for the dangerous vacillations with grave consequences?

First, nowhere is any kind of analysis being made, no kind of dazibao is going up which speaks of ideological deviations in line, except in the cultural field. Orientations against modern revisionism have been issued, have been altered, and new ones have been re-issued. But why did these vacillations in line occur? Who was responsible for them? There is not a whisper about this. Silence, at least for us and the public.

Let us take the question of the creation of the **«anti-imperialist front including even the revisionists».** The line of our Party on this capital problem has been consistent, unwavering, Marxist-Leninist. But not the line of the Communist Party of China. It wavered, and then was corrected. For our Party, «a front against imperialism including even the modern revisionists» was impossible, while for the Communist Party of China it was possible. On this capital key issue of colossal importance we found ourselves in major ideological and political contradiction with the Chinese comrades, and if they had not altered course, an ideo-political conflict between our two parties would certainly have arisen. The Chinese comrades saw our serious reaction and abandoned that dangerous course, because it is revisionist. **Without fighting revisionism properly it is impossible to fight imperialism properly. This is the Leninist thesis which guides us.**

But what would the Chinese proposal, «Let us go in one front against imperialism, together with the modern revisionists», mean? This would mean:

1 — The views of our parties were identical with those of the Soviet and other revisionists in regard to the

nature of imperialism, with American imperialism at the head, and our struggle against it would be completely identified with that of the modern revisionists.

2 — As long as this identity of views and these joint actions on this capital issue were accepted, then any other disagreement would remain the least important, because to engage in a joint struggle, together with the modern revisionists, against this savage enemy, American imperialism, and to wage the struggle effectively, you have to give up polemics and the stern struggle with the betrayers of Marxism-Leninism, and accept that the modern revisionists «are Marxist-Leninists with some mistakes which can be corrected, but still Marxists». At present some revisionist leader of the Korean Workers' Party and of the Communist Party of Japan defend this thesis and say, «by moving in one front with the Soviet revisionists against American imperialism and waging struggle against it we have also waged struggle against modern revisionism».

3 — To pursue this line would mean that our parties would have to put aside their ideological and political disagreements with the Soviet revisionists, accept the treacherous course of Khrushchevite «peaceful coexistence» accept the open and secret Soviet-American agreements and treaties, accept the Khrushchevite bourgeois pacifist ideas, accept their treacherous revisionist ideas on the party, the state and socialism, abandon the revolution and not support the peoples' national liberation struggle. In a word, if this line were followed, our Marxist-Leninist parties would line up with the revisionist parties «for the sake» of a false unity against American imperialism. This was the line and demand of the Khrushchevites.

4 — To proceed on this line would mean either to go over completely to betrayal, or to give the Soviet revisionists moral support and a weapon to attack you, and if you are to organize a front against American imperial-

ism you must analyse the full implications of this line. This, especially for us, means to have an identical policy, which entails identical ideological views, to organize our military and economic forces in unity with them. Therefore, we would have to build and adopt other political, economic and military stands in accord with a new situation created.

It is clear that the Soviet revisionists could never abandon their treacherous positions, but it would have to be we who abandoned our correct Marxist-Leninist positions. In other words, if we were to follow this line, we would go over from revolutionary positions to opportunist positions, in this way admitting that our line and stand have been wrong.

5 — If this line were to be followed, in the further development of events, China would have to change its stand towards India, or accept the Indian political position in regard to American imperialism, just as the Soviets accept it, and likewise, to accept the policy of other «independent» and «socialist» bourgeois states, which would take part in the «anti-imperialist front». If we were to follow such a line, we would have to accept the Titoite traitors in this «front».

As in the past, our Party would not fellow this treacherous anti-Marxist revisionist line, but would fight it to the end, as it had always done. However, the leadership of the Communist Party of China fell into error. For a time it advocated this line, unofficially, but quickly retracted this. However, the fact that the Chinese leadership advocated this wrong anti-Marxist line left its traces and had bitter consequences. The revisionists used it as a weapon and exploited this vacillation of the Chinese comrades.

This wrong line first was advocated to us by Liu Shao-chi. Without doubt, prior to advocating such a line to us (because the Chinese comrades knew very well that

we would make no concessions on this capital question, or on the others), they had advocated it to the Korean Workers' Party, the Vietnam Workers' Party, the Communist Party of Japan, the Communist Party of Indonesia, and the Communist Party of New Zealand. We resolutely rejected it and exposed it officially (without defining the source of it). As far as we know, the Communist Party of New Zealand also did not fall for this danger, while the others accepted it with enthusiasm. The present stands of some communist parties of Asia confirm this with the vacillations of their leaders and the clamour they are making about «Soviet aid», which is the practical realization of a part of this line. Finally, the events in the Communist Party of Indonesia confirm this.

Who in the Chinese leadership is responsible for this major question about which nothing is being said openly and publicly? Who is the supporter of this line which would be catastrophic if it were followed? Is it only Peng Chen? We are not convinced of this. Perhaps it is also Liu Shao-chi who has made mistakes? We cannot affirm this. Or is it Chou En-lai who showed such zeal in his brutal efforts to drag us to Moscow after the fall of Khrushchev?

If the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, which was held this month, has not analysed such a major mistake and has not determined who is responsible for it, then it has not done well. This means that the plenum has passed over the problems superficially, and this shows lack of seriousness. In fact, in the internal document which the Chinese sent out to their party about the Cultural Revolution (of which they gave us a copy) these major problems of line do not appear. Perhaps this will be kept rigorously as a purely internal party question.

However, the consequences remain and are grave: the Communist Party of Japan and some other party have

broken with our line. The leaders of these parties are revisionist. The blame for this cannot be put on the Communist Party of China, just as it must not descend to opportunism to keep these parties in line. But the fact is that the leaders of some parties are now using the vacillation in the line of the Chinese, which I dwelt on above, as a weapon against the Chinese and as their own correct line. They claim, «It is the Chinese who have shifted, it is they who are trying to impose their line on us». It is evident that here they are referring to the line of the struggle against revisionism, because they were in accord with the wrong line of the Chinese and continue to stick to it faithfully and to trumpet it publicly.

The Chinese comrades will find it difficult to attack this line of certain parties, because they have been compromised. This is another consequence of wrong stands. But we shall attack any revisionist stand, wherever it may come from.

Let us now look at the question of the Communist Party of Indonesia. It has suffered an extremely heavy blow. Naturally, the blame falls on the leadership of the Communist Party of Indonesia itself, not to mention the bourgeois reactionary, Soekarno, who was bound to play his own role, as he did.

But have the Communist Party of China and the Chinese Government any responsibility in this matter? Of course, we can make no categorical pronouncement, because we have no concrete knowledge of the internal relations of the Communist Party of China with the Communist Party of Indonesia; do not know whether they held comradely consultations and whether the Chinese comrades were in full accord with the course which the Communist Party of Indonesia followed, and to what extent the Communist Party of China influenced Aidit and his comrades. If the Central Committee of the Communist Party of

China was in agreement with this course and has exerted influence in this direction, then it has direct responsibility. But even if the opposite is true, still the Communist Party of China has indirect responsibility.

Towards the Communist Party of Indonesia and Aidit the official stand of the Chinese was one of flattery and encouragement. They patted him on the back, gave him titles, and approved his vacillating «line» towards the Soviet revisionists.

I think that the stand of the Chinese towards the Communist Party of Indonesia and Aidit was opportunist.

Why? Here I believe that the Chinese were influenced, just as much as Aidit, by the stand of Soekarno. Indeed, knowing the vacillating stand of the Chinese, who exaggerated the need to find support for their foreign policy, at all costs, among non-communist elements, or so-called democratic elements, I think that the Chinese had great faith in Soekarno, his policy of NASAKOM and his «friendship» with China. They not only supported the Soekarno regime materially with credits, and thus sought to compete with the credits which the Soviet revisionists gave it, but they jumped with joy and thought heaven was within their grasp when Soekarno walked out of the United Nations Organization. Chou En-lai was quick to declare that a new united nations organization had to be set up. But, with Soekarno's overthrow, reaction shattered his dream completely. Of course, China could not interfere, but its calculations about «the creation of a new united nations organization» did not work out, because there was something wrong, opportunist, in its policy. It did not look at this policy correctly in order to exert its influence, as it should have done, before the reactionary Indonesian coup d'état. But even later, China did not and does not maintain a good revolutionary stand towards Indonesian reaction.

China's stand is not dignified. Indonesian reaction humiliated China in Djakarta, burst into its embassy several times, beat up and injured the diplomats, seized and burned documents and furniture, burned the portraits of Mao and, finally, even ripped up the flag, the great symbol of the People's Republic of China.

What did the Chinese Government do? It struggled with several protest notes and a number of articles, but it never broke off diplomatic relations, even after all these provocations and humiliations. But they may say that this was precisely what Indonesian reaction was after, therefore they had to avoid falling for the provocation reaction concocted. I think that this assessment is wrong, and the Chinese comrades fell into this mistake, that they still have illusions about Soekarno and a possible change of heart on this part. The Chinese comrades were wrong in thinking that if they broke off diplomatic relations, they would be accused of having urged the Indonesian communists to carry out the September coup. (They were still accused of these things.) The Chinese comrades did not break off diplomatic relations, because they «might have been put on a par with the Soviet Government which broke off relations with Albania», but we were neither Nasution, nor Suharto, and the People's Republic of China is not the revisionist government of Khrushchev. If they thought they should not break off diplomatic relations with the reactionary Indonesian Government in order to avoid breaking off relations with the Indonesian people, I think that the people cannot hold in great esteem that friend who allows himself to be humiliated by his enemy.

I think that all these considerations led the Communist Party of China into failing to defend the Communist Party of Indonesia in this great misfortune which befell it. If you proclaim that you will defend the peoples of the

world who fight, if you are going to defend the communist parties and the communists, this was the moment to defend the Indonesian communist comrades, because this opportunity will never again present itself in such a dramatic manner.

What must the communists of Japan, Indonesia, New Zealand, etc. think about the internationalist solidarity in struggle on the part of the Communist Party of China? Of course, they cannot think much of it, because the stand adopted towards events in Indonesia and the Communist Party of Indonesia was not a good revolutionary stand.

Did the plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, which met this month, examine this important problem in order to define the responsibilities and draw the lessons? If it has not done so, this indicates a total lack of Marxist-Leninist seriousness.

It seems to me that these problems of line have capital importance, are key problems. It is fine, positive, and correct that the masses are organized in the Cultural Revolution, but these questions of line must be corrected before the question of haircuts and changing shop signs; you must publicly decide to liquidate the rent which is still paid to the Chinese capitalists before you change the names of streets. There are astounding contradictions in the Chinese line. There are good, correct aspects, but there are also wrong, sometimes anti-Marxist things, which make one wonder why they are done, how they are done, and how it is permitted that they are done!

FRIDAY
AUGUST 26, 1966

A SIXTEEN-POINT DOCUMENT ON THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IS APPROVED

Today I read a sixteen-point document on the Cultural Revolution which the recent plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China issued. In general, it is a correct and balanced document, in my opinion. The thread of ideas there is clear. Of course, in regard to the questions mentioned in it, the problems must be broad, complicated, but insufficiently known by us in their breadth and depth. However, from these sixteen points I understand the essence of the problem, see what the Central Committee is driving at, and how it envisages to achieve its aim in this revolution, which the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, also, recognizes as protracted, complicated, delicate and which, in its development, will have excesses, ebbs and flows, and zigzags. This is realistic, as is the fact that this revolution must be carried through to the end, regardless of the tactics, methods and measures which have to be taken

In reading this document, it seems to me that in essence the Chinese comrades present the problem correctly when they say that proletarian culture must triumph over bourgeois, capitalist and revisionist culture, and that any influence of bourgeois culture in the way of life, the way of thinking, people's consciousness, etc. must be radically purged. Such a thing is very correct and all the

Marxist-Leninist parties really have a very protracted and continuous revolution ahead of them.

From reading this document, we can draw certain conclusions about the situation in the Communist Party of China and in its leadership at all levels, as well as about the extent of the danger of the influence of bourgeois culture in the People's Republic of China. This document analyses the situation in each of the party committees and their stand towards bourgeois culture and evaluates the struggle which they have waged against it.

This implies to us that the enemy had infiltrated the party deeply, to the point that it had taken over the whole leaderships of party committees. According to the Chinese, the situation of the Party Committee of Peking and that of the Peking University confirms this. But there must be many like these in Peking, not to mention the party committees of other districts, of which there must be scores and hundreds, let alone the party branches.

As one can judge from this document, and as Comrade Mao and those in the leadership of the Central Committee who are dealing with the problem of the Cultural Revolution, judge it, the problem was very serious, because it is self-evident that such a dangerous situation could not have been created and could not have developed if the party and the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China had been vigilant and in revolutionary positions. Hence, it emerges as a logical deduction that not only has the organization of political work in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China been unsound, but there have been opposing lines, deviations and factions there, as I have said earlier, and these factionist elements have been operating freely for a long time. Many leaders at the centre and the base, irrespective of who they are, have degenerated ideologically and politically and have set out on a hostile course.

There is one thing that worries me. Although the sixteen-point document differs from the communique of the plenum, in which it came out clearly that the personality of Mao dominated the party, again in this case, the role of the Central Committee comes out as weak, although it is the Central Committee which brought out this sixteen-point document, and the role of the party and its call to take this situation in hand is likewise weak. It speaks only of the revolutionary students, exalting and encouraging them. This makes one think that the major question, that is, not just the cultural question, has not been solved conclusively in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, because previously it was said that «the minority can triumph over the majority, and the minority can be right». As to which minority and in what direction it is right, we cannot understand at present, but we shall see it in the course of events.

For such a major Cultural Revolution, these sixteen points could be, up to a certain degree, simply a general orientation to guide its development, but I think they are insufficient and do not cover all the problems, of which there are many and which it is difficult to include under the title of «Cultural Revolution»! We are seeing clearly how this Cultural Revolution is developing in practice. Along with the attack on the Party Committee of Peking and the Peking University, as well as on the «bourgeois academicians», the activity of some organs of the press were denounced, a number of novels, articles, and the activity of certain other elements were criticized. While accepting this criticism and denunciation as correct, it must be said, however, that this work is not complete, especially in order to attack the influence of bourgeois culture. Such work also fails to give clear guidelines about the many directions of the influence of this culture and

does riot define the methods of the struggle against it more clearly. Countless quotations of Mao are given, and a great to-do is being made about learning them. This is one aspect, but it is not everything, because in various directions, we do not see as much coherent, resolute activity as there should be. On the other hand, we follow the activities of the students, of which I have spoken previously, but these activities do not get to the root of the problem and are superficial. Their activities may be impressive, but only the organized revolutionary thought of the party can guide this great task properly.

It also emerges clearly from these sixteen points that some are opposed to this Cultural Revolution led by the students, because there is mention of some being afraid of the revolution of the masses. Naturally, the party cannot be afraid of the revolution, it must be the enemy that is afraid. Of course, there are those who are communists but who do not take a good stand, who are afraid, indeed there may even be leading groups in party committees who are afraid of the revolution, but this occurs either because they have degenerated or because they are secret enemies. However, the party, its whole Central Committee, which has been elected by the revolutionary will of communists within the norms of the party, and when these norms have been implemented properly in the daily life of the party, can never be afraid. The activities which are going on in China do not give this impression. On the contrary, they create the idea that these norms have been violated and have to be reinstated.

Can the question of religious belief be eradicated simply by closing some Catholic churches, as the students are doing, or by replacing the icons in churches with busts and portraits of Mao?!! Of course not. Religious belief in China must be a major problem, which cannot be solved with these measures.

Another incorrect thing strikes the eye in this Cultural Revolution: the school pupils and students hold the initiative in it and are its standard-bearers. The youth organization is not to be seen anywhere. But what is more serious still, there is no sign of the participation of the working class. It seems as if they are afraid of it. This is astonishing. It is not entering the battle, let alone the peasantry.

Is it possible to imagine the Cultural Revolution without the participation of the working class and the peasantry? Of course not. But the fact is that it is stated that the Cultural Revolution will be extended to the countryside later!!

One of the paragraphs of the sixteen-point document says that «our present aim is to combat and suppress those who hold leading posts, but have taken the capitalist road, to criticize the academic authorities...», etc. It is correct that such a struggle must be carried out, but as far as I know, and I know very little about «the academic authorities in China», this ought to be a broad field, and the necessary results cannot be achieved merely with what the students in Peking have done and are doing. It is possible that this revolution will be more deep-going, and this is necessary.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China puts forward correctly that the masses must be educated in movement, and this is a profoundly Marxist-Leninist principle. Proper mass discussions, inspired and led correctly by the party, are a basic Marxist-Leninist criterion of the strengthening of the party itself and of genuine proletarian democracy. However, the dictatorship of the proletariat requires that when you encounter such deep-going and dangerous hostile activity, when the «despots», as they call them in the document, have usurped the leadership, then repressive measures

must be taken against them. Up till now such a thing has been avoided to the point that these «despots» remain in the Political Bureau of the Central Committee. For example, up till now the name of Peng Chen and what is being done with him have not been mentioned.

However, many points of the document, while not putting the finger right on the sore spot, clearly imply that other main leaders, or factional groups, exist in China, who either will come out as «corrected», or will be openly attacked later. The classification which is made of cadres is characteristic. It does not emerge concretely from this classification who are included as the main ones in each category, instead this is left to the imagination.

We also see something new in this Cultural Revolution: the creation of groups, committees, congresses of the Cultural Revolution. It is said that these are to be led by the party. This is a new form which we must watch to see how it develops and what influence it will have in the solution of this great problem. However, if this work is not rigorously under the leadership of the party, then it will be carried out by a new organism, parallel with the party, and will take over one of its main functions, that of leadership in the field of ideology and the Cultural Revolution in general. I am not clear on whether the method of elections of the time of the Paris Commune comes into these committees or congresses, and I must clear this up. Likewise I must go back to the development of the «proletarian culture» in the Soviet Union and the criticism made of this by Lenin and Stalin and the Bolshevik Party.

It emerges from the sixteen points referred to that there are the «movement of socialist political education» and the «Cultural Revolution». Both of them must continue. One paragraph of this document says that where the «movement of socialist education» exists, it depends on

the party committee whether or not the Cultural Revolution should be carried out. Naturally, here, too, I am not very clear where one begins and the other ends, although the document says that one influences the other.

Apart from the aims which I explained, I think that this Cultural Revolution should have more profound aims, and if it aims at what I shall explain below, then that puts the situation in a different light, irrespective of certain excesses and the sometimes immature actions of the «Red Guard».

Although power appears to be in the hands of the proletariat, it is possible that the bourgeoisie is still powerful and dangerous. The Chinese comrades themselves say this when they put the question: Which will win in China, socialism or capitalism? The presentation of the problem in such a categoric manner, without defining where socialism has triumphed and where it has not triumphed, and where the bourgeoisie remains strong, has astounded us.

Many times the Chinese comrades have told us, of course, while belittling this force, that they have about 50 million enemies in China. Regardless of the fact that China has 700 million inhabitants, this enemy force is not small. Moreover, this colossal hostile force has certainly not sat and is not sitting with folded arms, but is working and exerting influence, fighting and sabotaging. **This hostile force has not felt the powerful fist of the dictatorship of the proletariat to the extent it should have, either in ideology or in the economy**, except up to a point in the economic field in the countryside. Industry, too, in China is declared to be socialist, but we see that the capitalists and the industrialists in enterprises still receive a set rent. It is said to be negligible, but such a thing is unacceptable. In fact this should not have been permitted, while the Chinese leaders have permitted it and still permit it. But at

the time when the Chinese have permitted the paying of this rent, all these capitalists continued to be in the possession of large amounts of liquid assets, which have not been touched at all! **Such a tolerant stand towards exploiters naturally has been associated with a soft and opportunist conciliatory policy towards them.** All this «coexistence» has been covered with the campaign of «re-education» from Pu Yi, the Emperor of Manchukuo down to the old industrialists.

Instead of receiving crushing blows, all these enemies were «placed in suitable jobs», «educated», and thus adapted themselves to the policy of the socialist state. In the new conditions, their hostile work was carried on in new forms in all sectors, but especially in propaganda and ideology.

I think that the Communist Party of China allowed such a state of affairs for a very long time, until now, when the external contradictions, the struggle against American imperialism and modern revisionism are becoming more acute, this internal enemy has activized itself and gone beyond the «established» bounds. At this point the Chinese comrades woke up. We cannot determine what serious difficulties they were faced with, but the Chinese comrades say that this was a «great conspiracy».

Measures had to be taken against enemies, but what course was chosen? Is this that we are analysing what is required, and will it achieve what the Chinese comrades want? We whole-heartedly desire this enemy force in China to be crushed as quickly as possible. If it were we we would have employed truly revolutionary measures against it. Apparently, the Communist Party of China does not want to give this struggle the true political colour it has and wants to liquidate this force in indirect ways and over a longer period.

We also see the support on and exaltation of the army.

It is strong, it is a weapon of the dictatorship of the proletariat, but it is not necessary that it should move now. Of course, the internal enemies are terrified of it, and in order to give them a first taste of the fist, Mao launched the «red guards» on the cities, because these must have been enemy hotbeds.

The «Red Guard» passes step by step from haircuts and changing street signs to more concrete demands against the city bourgeoisie, in a word, to the liquidation of its economic power and the old line towards it which has been pursued to the end. They have even gone so far as even to want to «amend the national flag», and on this they have acted correctly.

The change has to be made, but always under the leadership of the party. This is an internal question of China which will be solved by the Chinese comrades themselves, but we, as their friends and allies, think that, regardless of the circumstances, those who have degenerated into enemies must be struck hard. Likewise, all those who are responsible for this opportunist line, for a series of matters which I mentioned earlier, regardless of who they are, ought to be sternly criticized and receive the punishment they deserve. If at its recent plenum the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has analysed these matters objectively in a Marxist-Leninist way and has taken the necessary measures, we must welcome these measures. If this is not the case, this means that things are not going well. But the development of events will make things clearer to us.

SEPTEMBER 1, 1966
THURSDAY

THE «RED GUARD»

What this «guard» is in fact and why it is being created is not very clear to us. It is said that it is carrying out the Cultural Revolution all over China, that it «has been created to carry out a radical purge of the old culture, of the capitalist and revisionist bourgeois culture». Fine! But how is it going to carry out this «radical purge», what are the basic orientations from which it must proceed and how must it begin and carry out this purge? To me this is not clear at all. And, moreover, the beginning of this work is anarchic and confused.

Certain serious things strike the eye right at the start:

1 — The «Red Guard» is made up mainly of youth, university students, middle school pupils, and now their teachers have united with them. The members of the «Red Guard» are only citizens. Since this Cultural Revolution has a pan-Chinese character, not to say any more of it (because the Chinese propaganda wants to give and is giving the revolution this tendency), it cannot be restricted to the students, and led by them alone, because this creates the impression that this revolution belongs to the students alone, and that «they are capable of carrying it out and leading it». Thus it appears to us that so extensive and profound a Cultural Revolution, which has to do with the liquidation of a «bourgeois superstructure», which is in «strong» and even «threatening positions», as the Chinese

comrades tell us, is charged to a young stratum of the intelligentsia which is dominating the main class of society, the working class, although they have called this Cultural Revolution «proletarian». This, of course, is not on a correct line, even if you take it only from the formal angle, let alone if you examine it in essence. But the forms, too, will express many things and are, in fact, the visible reflection of the essence of the problem.

2 — If we speak about proletarian culture, it is a very surprising matter that the working class and the peasantry, or at least, the worker and peasant youth (since they want to give the revolution the colour of the younger generation) are sitting as onlookers and not taking part in this revolution. Whatever the Chinese comrades may say, nothing explains this equivocal stand. **In socialism, culture is not an adornment of only one stratum, but belongs to the whole people**, and if one has to have one's say about culture and art, it is the workers and peasants who should have their say before any one else.

Can it be said there is nothing to be purged from the consciousness of workers and peasants in China, or that bourgeois and revisionist culture has not influenced and does not influence them?! Then why are they not taking part in this movement to lead and guide it? Or, since the greatest sickness is among the intellectuals, in the universities and schools, should the working class not take part in this «radical purge»? How is it possible that neither the thought nor the action of the working class and the peasantry is being sought on such a major issue? How can this occur when the school and university youth, allegedly, have the right of entry everywhere, to make the law, to set the orientation in this revolution, and for its leadership to be taken over precisely by that stratum which has made the mistakes, and which, from its very nature, is in a vacillating position? **Only the proletarian**

reinforced concrete can make this anti-bourgeois and anti-revisionist wall impregnable, and if it requires the «iron broom» to clean up the filth, there can be no such broom without iron, that is, without the working class.

3 — If we say that the «Red Guard» is made up of the youth down to the young pioneers, then what has become of the Communist Youth, at one time a famous organization in China? Its voice is not being heard at all, it seems as if it does not exist, or is on the point of «fading out». Why? What has it done? Is it in order for a fraction of the youth to replace the whole organization, to destroy the tradition? If the structures of old organizations are ruined it should be stated why. If the «leadership of the youth has been in a hostile position», then these enemy elements must be purged and the organization must advance. All the indications are that everything which we are seeing and hearing is not in order.

What has the «Red Guard» done concretely for the «Cultural Revolution» up till now? It has come out in the streets, has begun the work with actions over which one could laugh and cry; it has violated the laws of the Republic, has frequently gone in opposition even to the directives of Mao, which the Chinese comrades publicize greatly; it has upset the good, let alone the bad, and has made a great commotion through the streets. However, this unrestrained, orchestrated and encouraged commotion has led the «Red Guard» into clashes with the working class in some cities in which hundreds have been injured. The present activities of the «Red Guard» are reminiscent of certain condemnable actions which were carried out before the war in order to prepare evil things.

The only concrete thing which the «Red Guard» does is: it defends Mao Tsetung and cheers him to the sky, it regards him as a God in the full sense of the term. Why are the street signs smashed and people forced to have

their hair cut? Such an action does not seem like a Cultural Revolution.

Up till now every action of the «Red Guard», every shout from it, has the sole aim of exalting the cult of Mao. All this gives the complete impression that someone is indirectly told, «There is none like Mao, don't touch Mao, you must follow Mao, or you'll live to regret it». Hence Mao is being defended by the school pupils and the university students. This is the impression which all the noise of the «red guards» gives, and this noise mounted to the skies on the eve of the meeting of the plenum of the Central Committee and was carried on even more vigorously after it. Then this makes one think that there have been clashes in the Central Committee, but with whom and why? Nothing is emerging.

Mao came out twice in a demonstrative way to see the parade, went amongst the demonstrators, was cheered to the sky, stayed with them and delighted in their fantastic exaltations; meanwhile Lin Piao, his comrade-in-arms, who is ranked immediately after Mao, a thing which is being made obvious and moreover in a demonstrative way, eulogizes him extravagantly and always tells the «red guards» the same thing: «Read Mao Tsetung thought». After him Chou En-lai, «the conductor of the orchestra», always rises to speak, and says the same things about Mao, plus a few others about Lin Piao. The other leaders of the party and the state follow this organized and orchestrated procession like extras in a film. Mao, Lin Piao and Chou En-lai are bringing people, supposed to have made mistakes, etc., to meetings in Tien An Men Square. This whole tableau creates the impression that in the leadership, too, things are going on, to a certain degree and in other forms, exactly as they are being done in the «Red Guard», when the baddies are made to wear the «dunce's cap» and then crawl through the streets.

The way this Cultural Revolution is proceeding, we cannot see clearly where it will end up; and apart from this, the truly revolutionary measures which ought to be taken against enemies, whether inside or outside the party, have been very much neglected, and the most essential organizational norms of the party have been violated.

An anti-Marxist xenophobia, which is becoming especially worrying, is being built up and developed in China especially against the Soviet peoples. The way they are acting in China, at least as I seet it, turns out that the struggle against Soviet revisionism, which has to be stern and uncompromising, has wiped out the distinction between the revisionist traitors and the Soviet people.

We shall see how this situation, which worries us greatly, will develop. From the speech which Chou En-lai delivered in Tien An Men Square the day before yesterday it is apparent that he is the main one in all this situation, regardless of the fact that it is Lin Piao that is being publicized. His speech was a program of work for the «Red Guard». Apart from other things, what strikes the eye in this programmatic speech is the fact that Chou En-lai made a great issue of: «We must leave the masses free to speak, to act and to make the revolution», etc. Who has stopped them acting freely up till now? Moreover, the masses, in the real meaning of the term, are not speaking yet, only one category of people is speaking, a small and most exalted part of the masses, but at the same time the most immature and unsuitable part, especially for the specific work which needs to be carried out.

In China today everything revolves around the Cultural Revolution and the clamour of the «Red Guard», as if there were no other problems, as if the Central Committee which met had only to decide on the famous sixteen points! But let us accept for the moment that only these sixteen points were discussed and decided. These deci-

sions are for the party, first of all, therefore they should first be presented to the party, for it to discuss them, to adopt them, and for it to lead. There is not a word in this direction; not a whisper that these directives are being discussed in the party; no support is being heard from the party, is it for or against?

Apparently, the party is still not being informed about the decisions of the Plenum. As far as can be seen, they have chosen the course of forming the opinion among the people and the communists by means of the «Red Guard», and have decided to put the issues to the party after this opinion has been formed. I draw this conclusion from the question which Chou En-lai raised in his speech when he says that the members of the «Red Guard» from the other provinces of the country will continue to come to Peking to gain experience. Hence, it seems that this noisy business is to continue and will be used against someone for something. Astounding methods!!

These are my judgements, but it would be in order for the Chinese to inform their Albanian comrades about what is going on and not to leave us in the dark to judge from the news reports.

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 20, 1966

THE «RED GUARDS» ARE ACTING WITHOUT LEADERSHIP OR CONTROL

The true purpose of the «Red Guard» movement remains unknown to us, regardless of the fact that the official Chinese propaganda says that it was created to carry out the Cultural Revolution. In fact, up till now we do not see much being done in this direction, apart from those things which I noted earlier.

We see that the Chinese comrades, with great hesitation, have begun to correct, to some extent, certain things which were quite unclear. Up to a point they have begun to say that the «Red Guard is led by the party», that «the working class and peasantry approve its actions», that «the working class is taking part in the Cultural Revolution», etc. In a word, they have somehow begun to say that the Cultural Revolution is not the privilege of students, pupils and teachers. Sometimes they imply that the «Red Guard» has done some «unpleasant-things and made demands «out of place and beyond its authority». Indeed recently they have stressed that the «Red Guard» must not interfere in the work of factories and communes. After all this, the «Red Guard» is now «toning down» its activities, little by little, going to «harvest the wheat», etc., etc.

Of course, the imperialist and revisionist enemies have launched a great anti-Chinese campaign full of

slanders. This does not surprise us and it should not be believed at all. But it is a fact that the Chinese themselves have provided the excuse for such a thing. Everything which the «Red Guard» does, indeed even more than it does or could do, could have been done better, more thoroughly, more correctly, in other forms and with other measures, under the leadership of the party.

Why did they not act in this way?! This remains unknown to us. The fact is that the «red guards» in China are acting without leadership or control; the «Red Guard» continues to exist. We shall see how it will work in the future, how it will be organized and what form it will take, or will it melt away like snow flakes in water?

In my opinion, on the basis of the obvious things, this «inflation» of, this clamour about, these competences and the epithets that were ascribed to the «Red Guard» could not continue for long, otherwise great doubts would be aroused about the issue. This gives the impression that there is nothing in China, apart from the «Red Guard» and Mao, Lin Piao and Chou En-lai. These four are above all, make the law, make the rain fall and the sun shine. My opinion is that the Chinese comrades ought to make a rapid withdrawal from this mistaken position. Perhaps I am wrong, but if so, this is because the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China has still not given us accurate information about the «real decisions of the recent plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China».

I think that they absolutely must inform our Party about these decisions which are the basis of these actions which are taking place there. The «excuse» that the Chinese ambassador in Tirana has been away from his post for four to five months «to do his physical labour» in China, is unacceptable! Does he need

so long to do his «physical labour»? During this period the personnel of the Chinese Embassy in Tirana are remaining as silent as mummies, keeping to the premises, and do not know what to say when one of our comrades asks them a question.

Our Party has maturity, it knows very well how to maintain a correct stand towards China, to defend it, but also to be cautious towards the exaggerations of the Chinese comrades, and towards anything which is not clear to us. Perhaps the Chinese comrades are displeased. We can't help that. Only on the Marxist-Leninist course will we always be in solidarity with them.

The Chinese comrades continue on an unsound, non-Marxist-Leninist, incorrect course to gather the sayings of this and the other person abroad, to build up the cult of Mao, and to orchestrate it with their own efforts at home. With all the respect we have for Mao as the leader of the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, they do not and never will have us with them on this course. We shall never allow our Party to be committed to the course of the cult of the individual.

Perhaps in these difficult situations the Chinese comrades need the cult of Mao, because only his great personality can cure the situation in the party and in the country. In this case such a thing could be justifiable for the internal situation, but such a line must not be imposed indirectly on friends and comrades whom they don't even keep informed of the development of the situation at home.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 23, 1966

OUR STAND TOWARDS CURRENT EVENTS IN CHINA

Faced with all these events which are happening in China, first of all, we must keep cool heads, and our judgments and stands on the problems there must be well-considered, based on facts and carefully sifted out from a rigorous Marxist-Leninist viewpoint. Above all we must adhere to principles, because only in this way will we avoid mistakes; we must be vigilant to ensure that in these complicated and delicate matters, we distinguish and grasp the key problems, which are the pivots of these events, and must not base our opinions and decisions on matters of second- and third-rate importance, because these could confuse us.

The Cultural Revolution, which has a great and profound significance, is not expressing in practice the real aims which it is supposed to have. Some of these aims are manifested in a chaotic way, are developing in an anarchic manner, are not clearly defined, and clear guidelines and directions about them are not being given. With the violent performances of the «Red Guard», the Cultural Revolution has come out of its framework and assumed more the appearance of a political revolution.

Hence, up till now, this Cultural Revolution is more clearly assuming the appearance of a violent political revolution against a political counter-revolution, which is not being talked about openly, but which is implied by

many directives in newspaper articles. In general, it is said that this revolution is aimed against reactionaries, revisionists and capitalists, who are in the party, in the state, in the leadership. A great deal is implied but nothing is stated precisely.

This counter-revolution has a leadership. Who is it? Is it in the head, in the body or in the tail? Who has been the author or authors of this counterrevolutionary conspiracy? How has all this enemy work developed, how was it permitted, and what measures were taken in the last plenum of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China? This is a mystery, here lies the main problem, and this the Chinese comrades are not telling even to us, their loyal friends! Only when we are acquainted with this shall we be able to see clearly, while now we can only make suppositions, surmises.

We have no doubts about our deduction that there are contradictions and fierce conflicts in the leadership of the Communist Party of China. All these events, contradictory events solved in the party way and in the non-party way, but mostly solved not in the correct party and state way, indicate this.

Not only do these things not make precisely clear to us what the mistakes in the line of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China have been and who has made these mistakes, that is, who is on the right road and who is on the wrong road, but the practice which is employed for the correction of these mistakes makes us suspect that the correct solution has not been found, that unity of opinion and action has not been achieved, and that one is trying to impose his ideas on the other in astonishing ways. The imposition of views with the methods being used there shows there are still vacillations, because there are ebbs and flows.

From what we can see, the tendency of the Chinese

comrades is that we and their other friends should follow in step with them, without reflecting, without the smallest effort on their part to explain the essence of the question to us. Of course, this is neither Marxist, nor comradely, nor friendly, therefore we cannot accept it.

It is because of these situations and such circumstances that have been created that our prudent, principled stand has great importance. We have had our fingers burned, therefore we are wary of the fire and we do not step on a rotten plank.

We do not budge a fraction from the Marxist-Leninist stand we have maintained towards the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China, notwithstanding that issues of the Cultural Revolution have not been clarified, and it is up to them to make things clear to us.

We must preserve and strengthen our Marxist-Leninist friendship and collaboration with the Communist Party of China and the People's Republic of China. However, we cannot budge a millimetre from our line towards them, without being enlightened and without being convinced as Marxist-Leninists about the events and their opinions.

There is something dangerous apparent among the Chinese comrades: the tendency that they can do without friends and comrades! In what does this appear? First, they are not keeping us informed about all this major thing which is going on there; second, they lump both their friends and their enemies together. Today they notified us to withdraw for one year our students who are studying in China.

This and other things are not good signs and damage both them and us. Today they demanded the withdrawal of our students, tomorrow they might demand the return of their specialists on the pretext that they must do

their physical labour or take part in the Cultural Revolution. Under their «leftisms» we see actions which have an unhealthy smell of bad things to come. We shall keep our heads, we shall be very careful, but we cannot but be worried about these actions.

However, our Party is hardened to difficulties, it has great experience, it has a correct line, and whatever wind or gale may blow up, our Party will not be shaken.

SATURDAY
SEPTEMBER 24, 1966

WE MUST AVOID BEING TAKEN BY SURPRISE

Each day that goes by brings us fresh worries about the course on which events are developing in China.

The Chinese request about the withdrawal of foreign students for a year, including our students, has an objective reason. The Chinese have closed the universities, everything is in disorder and confusion in them; the professors have been seriously confused by the Cultural Revolution; the «Red Guard» is discrediting them, burning their books and libraries, and there are no school textbooks according to the («red guards») «line» although we still cannot see clearly what this «line» of theirs about the school is.

But another important aspect is the political one. From the reports we are receiving we learn that the Chinese are meeting serious opposition in the development of the Cultural Revolution, the activities of the «Red Guard» and the propagation of the cult of Mao. The students from the various countries who are in China follow the line of their own parties. And quite correctly, our students, too, who have been advised to be quiet, prudent and defend the line of the Party, are acting in this way. On the part of the Chinese students there is correct behaviour towards our students, but there is no longer that former enthusiasm in the relations with them, while with the Vietnamese, Koreans and Mongoli-

ans, the Chinese students have open contradictions. That is why the Chinese have chosen the course of sending them away allegedly for one year.

Politically this is a great mistake. The Chinese with full conviction and an easy conscience think that they are doing well, but with this they are inflicting losses and isolation on themselves. This shows another dangerous thing, namely, that they are not concerned what others may say. In a word, they imply to others, «We are going about our own business, and it does not worry us what others think, we are a big country, a big party, we know what we are doing, and what we are doing we are doing correctly; follow us if you like, if not, that's your affair».

The major fact that the Communist Party of China has not even informed us about what is going on in China and what they have decided to do, confirms this anti-Marxist stand. This means: read our newspapers, approve us, praise us, and follow us.

On the other hand, seeing our correct reaction, that we cannot follow them in their dubious excesses, the Chinese, through their people in Tirana, have begun to carry out the first provocations, which remind us of the old methods of the Titoites and the Khrushchevites. The Chinese go through our country and buttonhole people, one after the other, «to interview» them on what they think about the Cultural Revolution, about Mao, and the «Red Guard». These «interviews» have two aims: first, they are to be printed in Peking to serve in the «great orchestra», and second, to urge our people to speak about these problems and to create suspicions that «the Albanian leadership is opposing the 'ardent' desire of people in Albania». Naturally, these «Chinese correspondents» have not achieved their objective. But they continue to work in this direction.

Today the Chinese students who are studying in our

country sought permission to prepare «an exhibition to show what foreigners are saying about Mao Tsetung». This is an open provocation against us, who do not agree to shout hosannas for Mao. Our youth put them in their place, carefully but clearly.

These are the «first needlings», but if their line is not rectified they might go even further with us. We have had bitter experience, therefore we must not be caught unawares. In this situation the need arises to re-examine one by one, in detail, but without any publicity, the projects of the 4th Five-year Plan, with which China is supplying us on credits. We must examine this whole thing in the dynamic of the Chinese commitment to build the projects and the possibility that China might cut off the credits or create difficulties for us, or postpone the construction of projects at a time when we have committed large material and monetary funds to them. Therefore, in the construction of these projects we must proceed cautiously, from the simplest to the biggest, so that if «they leave us in the lurch» it will be possible for us to complete them ourselves. On these things, of course, we still shall have time to see the political predispositions of the Chinese more clearly.

I have confidence that the Chinese comrades will not reach the point of adopting this course with us, but I foresee that if they continue on this line we shall have even political and ideological frictions; this depends on them, because we shall not budge from our Marxist-Leninist line, from our open and sincere friendship on the Marxist-Leninist road.

MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 26, 1966

THE ARMY IS RECOMMENDED AS A MODEL FOR ALL, EVEN FOR THE PARTY

The unclear situation in China, the failure of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China to give our Party any official information, compels us to make hypotheses on the basis of the information in the Chinese press. **All that is occurring in China could be the «doing of armymen»** with Mao at the head.

What are we observing from the press? For more than a year the Chinese press has been publicizing the army more than it should, although it is trying to do this without making it very obvious. Truly, the tense international situation requires that importance must be given to the army, that its strength, armaments, etc., etc., should be publicized. This is normal, but on the basis of the above hypothesis, certain expressions of Mao's which especially attract attention, are appearing in the Chinese press: **The army is recommended as a model for all..., even for the party.** This implies that Mao and the armymen behind him are wanting to impose everything of the army, from its education down to its «modesty», on the party, that is, it emerges that **«in the army the line of Mao, the ideas of Mao are being applied in a brilliant way, but not in the party and elsewhere».** These ideas have been raised to a crescendo, but at first they could not strike the eye as abnormal, because nothing was imposed openly on

the party, but on the contrary, everything appeared to be done «in the name of the party, the Central Committee and Mao».

This view became more and more stressed. In the press of the army a number of novels were attacked and others were written; the system of military rank was abolished, but **before this was done, Lin Piao came out with an article of exaltation which in those situations could still be taken as normal and necessary.**

Later, and after the Cultural Revolution had cropped up, Lin Piao's other article, «On Mao Tsetung Thought», came out. Here we began to see the exaggeration and to sense more strongly that there was something going on, **because the article went beyond the norms of the party and overstepped all bounds**. The bounds were overstepped when the Cultural Revolution burst out strongly, and after the plenum of the Central Committee, with the emergence of Lin Piao in the limelight, as second to Mao, with his emergence as the main leader for the «Red Guard», and in the subsequent activities.

In May this year, when a delegation of ours was in China, Mao said to our comrades, among other things: **«They say that I am a philosopher, a thinker..., no, this is not true, I am an armyman...».**

Another thing. Mao also told our comrades about the cadres of the Communist Party of China: **«Things have gone so far that our district secretary will sell himself to the enemy for a pound of pork...».**

These are a few isolated facts, but in the light of events and in the darkness in which we are groping, they might help to make things clear and guide us. Perhaps this is what occurred: In recent times Mao has not been greatly involved in leadership, has shut himself up in his ivory tower, or has been isolated by others, who come from time to time to give him general information. Meanwhile,

those who are leading are others, with their good points and their mistakes. **Certainly there are ample mistakes, and mistakes of principle at that, and Mao cannot be excluded from them.** Naturally, life is going on in China. **There will be mistakes, but in a number of key political and ideological directions, the main orientations are Mao's, and serious vacillations have been proved in these, but there must also be grave errors committed by others, which I have mentioned earlier.**

The fact is that Mao has been isolated from the life of the party and the country, and is informed only by others. Amongst the civilian masses, the party is encountering and struggling with the difficulties, while the army and the armymen cannot encounter these difficulties so strongly and intensively, therefore those who inform Mao have seen these problems to some extent from the outside, have seen only the black side, and have told him of this, hammering them into his head, and **have convinced Mao that it was necessary to act, to strike without mercy. Mao has reached the situation where he must have lost confidence in the cadres of the party, and thinks that the army has to take this purge in hand under his direction.** He began this purge by setting in movement the students, who were turned into «red guards», **initiating the Cultural Revolution which was turned into a political revolution under the leadership of Mao and Lin Piao, backed up by the army.**

What might have occurred in the last plenum of the Central Committee? Let us continue with the above hypothesis. The line of the party has been analysed and Mao, Lin Piao, etc., *en bloc*, have attacked all the others and accused them of everything. Naturally, the others must have defended themselves in their grave errors. Mao and Lin Piao took over the reins, attacked the old, pushed

them aside, and «came out in Tien An Men Square». In his two speeches Lin Piao says: **«We must attack those who are in power and who have taken the capitalist road...», «Storm the headquarters». It is clear that the «red guards» everywhere in China, apart from other things, attacked the party committees. Hence the action was to be carried out from below up, and this was to be done through the student youth, the «Red Guard»; the army was to stand ready but should not move; the workers and peasants were not to be stirred up, and all this was to be covered with the cult of Mao, which grew into mysticism.** Mao and Lin Piao must have been in a minority in the Central Committee, but the split was avoided by the cult of Mao, because neither side wanted to put Mao in the balance, but the armymen seized the occasion and decided the issue, because Mao was with them.

Thus, under the cult of Mao, one side acts while the other is suppressed under its own mistakes, but tries to recover slowly. From many actions of those who stand behind the «red guards», it is obvious that those are not political people, party people; they are certainly fanaticized. There has to be a certain retreat from these actions. Perhaps the others are recovering themselves, little by little, and do not want to come out openly, but are trying «à la Chinese» to regain the ground they have lost.

Who is Chou En-lai with in fact?! This is still in doubt. Hence this doubt, too, must not be discarded. At present it is the armymen who have the first say and they have Mao at the head, and with him they are gaining the lost positions.

Anything which is not on a correct, Marxist-Leninist party road, and not developing on this road, is wrong. We always ask the question: Why is the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China not informing us about the events which are occurring there?! Continuing

with this hypothesis, is this failure to inform us normal? Who should inform us? The Central Committee? **In fact there is no Central Committee.** Those who are the main figures cannot inform us because if they do this they would have to inform us about all the problems. However, such a thing is dangerous. Likewise, even the headquarters of the «Red Guard», which is effectively running things, cannot do this, or more accurately, **it «informs us» through the newspapers and dazibaos. «This is the line,» they say, «read it and follow us if you wish.»**

Let us see what the outcome will be. What sort of stand will they adopt, what sort of speeches will they deliver, what sort of manifestations will they hold on their National Day? These may cast some light in this thick fog. However, this is only an hypothesis because we do not know precisely how all this has occurred.

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 6, 1966

VERY ASTONISHING

In the articles of the Chinese press the name of the Communist Party of China is being obscured more and more each day in a completely shameless way. The name and role of the party, either in the past or at present, is not mentioned at all. **The name of the party has been completely replaced with the name of Mao, the cult of Mao, the ideas of Mao.** Between the month of May and now, if I am not wrong about the time, the Chinese line on this problem has changed completely. Even before, Mao was spoken of to an excessive degree, but the party and the Central Committee were kept in the limelight. However, since May, the latter two have virtually disappeared from the vocabulary.

Everything is being identified with Mao, Mao has done everything and he is presented by the Chinese propaganda as a «God», as «infallible», the lone «Polar Star»; inside and outside China there must be only Mao and his ideas. Mao has replaced the party, and Mao Tsetung thought has replaced Marxism-Leninism. And they present the matter thus: **Either on this road or against it.**

Now it is emerging clearer that the Chinese army is playing a decisive role in this course. It is with Mao, and Mao is with it. It turns out that the army «represents and applies» the line of Mao and the ideas of Mao in the

most «correct» way. **Therefore, it is «the main ideological and political leader at the present moment». The party and the people are relegated to second place, «the party must learn from and be guided by the army»!**

From such a presentation of this colossal problem, one cannot but reach the conclusion that in China at present there are two powers, two poles, in struggle: the army with Mao on the one side, and a powerful part of the leadership of the party with «a group of capitalists», as Lin Piao calls them, at the head, on the other side. According to the signs, Liu Shao-chi must be at the head of this group. What does this group represent, what are its political and ideological views? It is difficult to make a precise pronouncement on this, because they are saying nothing.

What must emerge from this? Certainly, there is a big faction in the ranks of the leadership which is reflected in the party, too. One is compelled to think that Mao's group does not have its strength in the party and is fighting the other force from the positions of the army and Mao's personality. Mao and Lin Piao «are attacking the headquarters», «in order to liquidate the capitalist group at the head of it» from these positions and with these forms in the way they are developing.

A striking fact in all these actions, in all the articles and especially those of the army, is not only that there is no mention of the party and its role in the army, but also that, besides the cult of Mao, the cult of Lin Piao is developing, too. The press is saying such things as «the army is led and advancing under the **personal** leadership of Lin Piao».

From outside it is difficult to distinguish the views of the two groups clearly. If we take as a basis what the official press is saying, that everything is done under the leadership of Mao, then it appears that these others «are enemies». But why they are enemies, what they have

done, what «their great plot» consists of, this is not being said. This requires frank, open explanations which the Chinese officially are avoiding. But why? They have absolutely no reason not to tell us. But even if we suppose that the theses of Mao's group are correct and «the plot is a major one», the forms and methods which are being used to liquidate this group are not correct, not Marxist-Leninist.

In the first place, if Mao's group is right, it should base itself on the party and the people, without excluding the army, but should not ignore the party, or scorn it, or impose itself on the party by means of the army. In this case the question arises whether the party is for or against Mao. But since these «headquarters», which are being attacked, are a minority, is it permissible that the party should be abandoned and confused with them?! In that case it can no longer be said that only «a small group of capitalists», but that the whole party, is on the road to degeneration. Can this be so? In no way!

But can it be said that there are «enemies» at all levels of the party, from the centre to the base? There could be some degree of truth in this, but they are not all enemies. It is a fact that the committees and individuals have been classified in the sixteen points of the document, which the last plenum of the CC of the Communist Party of China issued. **Then why do they not rely on the good ones and purge the bad ones, but set the students to «attack the party committees» and entirely eliminate the leadership, the strength and authority of the party, and replace it with Mao, with his ideas, and the military force?!**

But let us still proceed with hypotheses, rounding things out. The Chinese comrades with Mao at their head learned from the bitter experience of the Soviet Union, where the Soviet Marxist-Leninists were lulled to sleep by the revisionists, who lured the Marxist-Leninists into intri-

gues, compromised them, seized power, and did all those things we know about. Let us suppose that «such a plot» was being prepared in China, too, and the Chinese comrades, with Mao at the head, detected it and are taking measures. But they are not saying what this «plot» consists of. They have been declaring that the political and ideological line of the party has been and is correct. The struggle against modern revisionism, against imperialism has been and is correct (there might have been vacillations, some might have made mistakes, this is not excluded), the economic line has been correct and has given results (although mistakes may have been made).

Then have they been on the wrong road only in the field of culture? Well, let us accept this. But how can we accept that culture has developed apart, or isolated from other things? Has everything been bad in this cultural line? Everything was done in the name of Mao, he saw them in advance, they were developed under «the teachings, writings and directives of Mao».

But let us accept that all is just as the Chinese press says, let us accept that this is a major plot. How will it be liquidated? By these «enemies» remaining in the leadership? In our opinion, it cannot be put right in this way. The matter should be presented: either these are «capitalist enemies» and must be liquidated, or they are comrades who have made serious mistakes and should be removed as soon as possible from any rank of leadership, or they are comrades who have made mistakes on certain questions, but have recognized their mistakes and have made self-criticism. Then, in the latter case, should things have been done in the way they were? Here I am not referring either to the measures which the Chinese comrades are taking for the elimination of that literature which they consider bad and revisionist, or for the carrying out of the Cultural

Revolution in the correct Marxist-Leninist way, of course, in their circumstances in China.

It seems to me that in these questions «great leaps» are not to be recommended and will not yield good results. All these things will undoubtedly have consequences. May they turn out well, and we be wrong, but we will never be idealists and will never proceed blindly on any path without being convinced with Marxist-Leninist arguments.

MONDAY
OCTOBER 10, 1966

THESES ON THE UNITY OF THE INTERNATIONAL MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT

Following the split, unity is required.

The struggle against modern revisionism cannot be wag d without Marxist-Leninist unity.

The 1st and 3rd Internationals.

There are two concepts about unity:

1) Revisionist «unity» (with its variants).

2) Marxist-Leninist unity.

We must expose the former and consolidate the latter.

Does complete Marxist-Leninist unity of thought and action exist in the international Marxist-Leninist movement?

Yes and no, but not to the extent and in the way it should, because of the growth of this movement and the lack of experience, because of the isolated positions of each Marxist-Leninist party or revolutionary group, and because there is not complete identity of views on many capital common problems, as well as because of the organized and combined struggle which revisionism and imperialism are waging against Marxism-Leninism.

Hence, it is necessary to find the forms and methods to overcome these obstacles.

The international communist movement must be guided by Marxism-Leninism interpreted and applied

correctly in the present general conditions, and in the specific positions of each Marxist-Leninist party or group. Hence, there is a need for an analysis of the current situation, which cannot be done by one party alone, the view of which would be the guiding light for the others. It is necessary also to have consultations among Marxist-Leninist parties or groups from which correct guidelines will emerge for the struggle in the overall and specific conditions.

Capital problems which should have a common definition, which tempers unity and boosts the struggle against modern revisionism:

1) The definite break with the revisionists requires a special meeting.

2) The birth of revisionism, its causes, etc., etc.

3) The question of Stalin.

4) The stand towards the Soviet Union, in the first place, and the other countries where the revisionists are ruling.

5) A more studied stand about more organized political, ideological, technical and material aid to the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, the national liberation struggle, about alliances with the progressive anti-imperialist bourgeoisie, and many other problems of this type of great importance to our common struggle.

All these and other things are known and applied in general, but not in a co-ordinated way.

On the question of Stalin and the causes of the birth of revisionism in the Soviet Union and elsewhere there are many ideas which are compatible, but also those which are not. If these things are not cleared up and a more or less identical opinion is achieved, contradictions may

arise, and the beginning of the contradiction, a thing which is hindering the strengthening of our unity, exists.

The strategy and tactics of our struggle. The former must be the same for all, the tactics may be different, but must serve the former and be developed for the correct application of Marxism-Leninism.

— Why were the twenty-five points of the Communist Party of China (**1**) issued and what is their fate?

— The tactics of the People's Republic of China and of the People's Republic of Albania.

The tactics of all Marxist-Leninist parties and groups which operate in the opposition or illegality.

a) The question of borders with the Soviet Union.

b) The Indian question.

c) The question of Korea and Japan.

d) The question of the Communist Party of Poland (Marxist-Leninist).

e) The aid that should be given the Marxist-Leninist groups.

The Communist Party of China is avoiding general meetings.

a) It proposed the meeting of our nine parties. When we accepted, the CP of China cancelled it.

b) Without holding a meeting, it proposed the creation of an «anti-imperialist front even with the revisionists», and then retracted it.

c) It holds meetings with other parties, one at a time, which it is entitled to do, and after such meetings these parties come out with statements and articles which defend everything which China says and does.

d) Now the entire concern of the Communist Party of

---

1 The article «A Proposal Concerning the General Line of the International Communist Movement», «Renmin Ribao», June 1963.

China is that the Marxist-Leninist communist movement should accept that the ideas of Mao Tsetung lead the world, accept the cult of Mao, the Proletarian Cultural Revolution and the entire line of the Communist Party of China with its good points and its mistakes.

All these things pose many threats to unity.

We must be clear and must not be afraid to look the truth in the eye. Even with us, the Chinese comrades have begun to have silent differences, internally, but there is the danger that these differences will be enlarged. Therefore, we must anticipate events. This we have done and must do. But how are we to explain things openly between our two parties? If these discussions are held on a completely Marxist course, the problems will be solved, otherwise they will get worse; this is how it began with the Soviets and we did not solve anything. They were solved at the Bucharest Meeting and the Moscow Meeting. Things must not reach this point with the Chinese, but it might come to this against our will.

Just as the opinions of one party cannot be accepted en bloc, neither can those of two parties be accepted en bloc. All must state their opinion. Therefore, the joint meeting and the taking of joint decisions is important. The meeting will be informed of and study the forms of the work and organization and set tasks for each individual party.

Up till now China has avoided this kind of meetings. Why?

a) To avoid being accused of seeking hegemony, an opinion which is not correct.

b) Lest we, the others, take a wrong view of its stand about these meetings. (We have demonstrated our internationalism.)

c) It doesn't want partners in its decisions. Such a view and stand is dangerous.

d) It is avoiding this because it still lacks internal unity. Then it should tell us this.

In view of all these things:

Is it right and necessary for us to present this idea in broad outlines at our Congress? I think it is. This is normal, one of the forms of our struggle.

There is no one to oppose the idea in principle; the most they can do is to leave it to melt away from lack of action. But it is they who will be wrong, and not us. In these situations, we cannot hold such meetings without China. China might continue not to want them. Then it bears the responsibility for this. But even though it is not going to find this idea opportune, since we considered it correct from every aspect, we must put it foward. Let the meeting be held when the conditions are ripe; let the struggle decide its organizational forms, etc. We have fulfilled any obligation to China on this issue once, and again on a second occasion. It is China that has postponed the carrying out of this idea.

I think the problems which I put forward above and others like these are very important at present for strengthening the Marxist-Leninist unity of the international communist movement, and cannot be solved apart from joint meetings of the parties. Apparently China does not see it this way and thinks that it is sufficient if we all unanimously approve what is going on in China today, and that our unity is strengthened with this. A further controversy is being added to the others, and judging by the way the Chinese are operating tête-à-tête, we have to envisage that one fine day we might find ourselves isolated from them, although we are on the right road. There-

fore, we must foresee all the clanger. What I propose are legal, correct forms.

They acted this way, tête-à-tête, on the questions of Korea and Japan, and precisely because of this, things have reached the state we are aware of.

The people of the new groups and parties write in their press organs in exalted terms about what is occurring in China, but, when they come here, they tell us that they are not in agreement with this or that idea of the Communist Party of China. And we, what can we say to them?

Tomorrow these Marxist-Leninists will come to the Congress of our Party and speak. Who can assure us that there will not be some among them who, with or without ulterior motives, will speak in exalted terms about aspects of the line and current developments in China on which we have opposing views? The two stands will appear. But if they ask us and seek our opinion, with good or bad aims, how are we to reply to them? Should we reply to them at all? This will be bad. What if we don't reply to them? This is still bad. Therefore, what we put in the report is the most correct, the most Marxist-Leninist reply we can give the foreign comrades.

MONDAY
OCTOBER 17, 1966

AGAIN ON THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA

Let us make the following hypothesis:

It is true that the international situation appears serious and critical. American imperialism is preparing itself and is threatening war on all of us, but especially on China. The latter has to be exceptionally well prepared militarily, but in the first place it must be prepared politically. Its base area must not only be strong, but be thoroughly purged of the revisionist fifth column. The moral and political unity of the people around the party and Mao has to be exceptionally strong and steeled.

Let us say that in such situations anything can be accepted, I am also speaking of the unrestrained cult of Mao, which has burst out in the recent months, but the obscuring, no matter how little, of the party can in no way be permitted. Having shown themselves very liberal on line for many years on end, now the Chinese comrades consider the situation critical and want to eliminate this liberalism which has been flourishing for a life-time, right down among the rank-and-file, let alone among the top leaders. However, they have run and are running into great resistance. And the Chinese comrades have found «the means» which can smash this resistance: Comrade Mao, who ac-

cording to them, now remains the only leader who can inspire the party and the people on the right course.

If the question in the party has been reduced to this predicament, then it is proper, one may say, that Comrade Mao should correct this situation, because the Chinese people and communists have complete confidence in him. **But Mao must correct this situation by relying on the party, first of all. I think that this is where he has to begin, because this is the only guarantee for every victory.** We do not see that Mao is calling on the party, the working class or the revolutionary peasantry. Perhaps, they consider the question in this way: «When Mao speaks the party speaks».

Mao, as a «great Marxist-Leninist», ought to know that without the party nothing could have been done and nothing can be done. It is also true that he is such an authority that when he speaks about the Communist Party of China he thinks of himself, and vice-versa. But if the situation is so critical it can be cured only by arousing the party; otherwise it must be thought that others have tried in cunning ways during this period to undermine the party, to undermine the authority of Mao and to build up their own authority. **It is possible that this has occurred, because in fact, the Chinese comrades were a bit asleep.**

The great propaganda campaign about studying the works of Mao can and should be criticized over the forms and methods which are being used, but if you take it as part of this problem and in the light of the hypothesis we are making, this is natural, for on the one hand, people learn, and on the other hand, the ideas of Mao are propagated, and this is done in the interest of the cause. **However, we must be vigilant and prudent on this question, must follow the orientations we decided at the recent Plenum of the CC of the Party. (1)**

---

1 The 18th Plenum of the CC of the PLA, October 14, 1968.

The Chinese delegation which will come to the 5th Congress of our Party can explain many things to us. 1 am jotting down a number of questions, naturally very prudent ones, which we might ask in order to be clearer about this situation. The questions are of this nature:

— We would like to know in more detail about the hostile activity of the anti-party elements in the cultural field.

— Have these enemies succeeded in attacking the political and economic line of the Communist Party of China, and have they constituted a serious danger to the state power in China?

— If possible, explain to us the features these enemies have in common with the other modern revisionists, and whether they have established organizational links with them.

— If possible, we would like to know in detail the basic orientations of the Chinese Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

— Does the Chinese Proletarian Cultural Revolution include the whole of China, or is it concentrated on the intellectual strata and the cultural and educational institutions?

— Is the «Red Guard», comprised of pupils, students and professors, simply a revolutionary movement of these strata, or is it a nucleus of some new organization of student youth which will be led by the Communist youth of China, or directly by the party?

— Has the «Red Guard» been charged with political

tasks, and in what forms is it guided by the party, either at the centre or at the base, in this activity?

— What organizational forms has the «Red Guard» adopted at the centre and the base?

— Although this is simply an internal question of yours, if it is possible, we should like to have a little more extensive knowledge about the meaning of the directives issued by Comrade Lin Piao about «the capitalist elements in power» and about the revolutionary action, «attack the headquarters of the reactionaries in power».

— In the opinion of the Communist Party of China, of what do the ideo-political differences of the Communist Party of Japan and some other party with our parties consist?

— If possible, we would like to be informed about the current situation of the Communist Party of Indonesia. Did the Communist Party of Indonesia have knowledge of the coup d'état by Wu Tung? Did it take part? And why did it find itself unorganized and why did it not face up to the barbarous reaction of the white generals in a revolutionary way?

— Please, tell us frankly, in a comradely way and without the slightest reserve your impressions about the proceedings of the 5th Congress of our Party, and about the various political and theoretical views of our Party.

SUNDAY
OCTOBER 23, 1966

NOTHING IS SOLVED CORRECTLY WITHOUT THE PARTY

It seems that the Chinese comrades have woken up from their deep sleep, have begun to reflect about their line pursued up till now, especially since the 8th Congress, have made an analysis and observed that they have permitted an opportunist, not to say revisionist, line to be followed for a long time. Since they say that «they have analysed the causes of the birth of revisionism in the Soviet Union», in this analysis they must have seen themselves as in a mirror, and must have arrived at bitter conclusions.

The fact is that their last Congress, the 8th, which was held in 1956, was under the direct influence of the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. **Many main theses of the 8th Congress, in Liu Shao-chi's report, are Khrushchevite theses adopted by the Chinese comrades completely. It is quite obvious that they were in agreement with Khrushchev in his main theses against Stalin, pro Titoism, for peaceful coexistence, etc. Apart from this, a very dangerous revisionist opportunist internal line was developed extensively and at length at the 8th Congress.**

In a few words, the Chinese comrades minimize the class struggle, and one may say, have shared the economic power with the capitalist bourgeoisie to which they

guarantee a third of the profits, guarantee its remaining at the head of the administration, and vigorously recommend coexistence with it, etc. In the Front (1) they give the bourgeois parties almost the same political rights as the Communist Party of China, and indeed say that these parties have the right of control over the party. In regard to the old intelligentsia, not only do they maintain a «correct» stand towards it, but they almost exalt it. On top of all this, in the report to the 8th Congress, everything is put forward in connection with «the education and re-education» even of big landowners, about whom it says that «they must take part in the co-operatives», and the capitalist, who **«have enthusiastically accepted the leadership of the working class and the Communist Party of China».**

In a word, one must re-read the report to the 8th Congress in order to see the full extent of the line which the Chinese are following, which has been carried out in practice in an unrestrained manner, without check-up, without congresses, without meetings of plenums, causing the catastrophes which have now made the Chinese comrades wake up a bit from their sleep and say, «Where are we going?!!». In their recent analysis they have seen that the capitalists and revisionists have captured important positions in the party and the state, and that they have to be rooted out from there. They have met with resistance in the analysis which they must have made.

But how could this resistance have presented itself? Mao and other comrades, collectively, may have recognized the mistakes in line. This would have been correct. Or the opposite may have been the case; they may have laid the blame on one section with Liu Shao-chi at the head, irrespective of how much he is at fault. Such a

---

1 The Political Consultative Conference of the Chinese People.

thing would not have been correct. In the first instance, Liu Shao-chi and his group may have risen in opposition and defended the theses of the 8th Congress «by giving the reasons for them», while in the second instance, they have not only defended the theses, but have also sought to find the extent of the blame and responsibility of all. If the analysis has been carried out according to the first version, Mao and his comrades have attacked Liu and his associates correctly and they have been half, or a quarter «convinced»; on the other hand Mao, seeing that the purge could not proceed in that way, acted as he did, by calling this revolution cultural, and set the school youth in motion.

But why did he act in this way? In order to avoid giving the impression that the work done up to that time by the leadership, and especially by the Liu Shao-chi group, has been a «counterrevolutionary, revisionist» work? In order to avoid raising the party «against the party», to avoid raising the working class «against the party»?

Mao should have mobilized the party against the revisionist factionists, should have aroused the party and the working class to put the line, the norms, the laws of the dictatorship of the proletariat in order, and that would have been enough. This might have been painful for them, too, both for those who had gone to sleep and for those who had acted, **but this would have led to a correct and complete solution, and not to patching things up. Either the opportunist line of the 8th Congress will be radically changed, or things will proceed lamely.**

Only the party can do this, but only in a Marxist-Leninist way, otherwise it is not on the right road. This must not occur. Then «breast the current» with the healthy section, crush the enemies, and correct the line completely, then you have no reason to whisper in the ears of the

students: «Do this, expose him, attack this committee or elect that committee», this is not in order.

To fail to put the working class into action in order to correct things on the spot, allegedly because the working class must not be raised «against the party», and on the other hand, to arouse the students to «elect» the party committees for the working class and dictate to it what it should do, this is not at all on the right road. Moreover, if you set the working class in motion, you do not set it against the party, but against revisionists, against their resistance. Is there, or is there not resistance on their part? If there is, then why do you want to hide it and cope with it in a half-pie way?

Nothing can be solved correctly, no correct Marxist-Leninist line can be decided or accepted, without the party, without the working class in the forefront. Any other road leads to mistakes, to things fraught with many dangers for the future.

MONDAY
OCTOBER 24, 1966

HOW SHOULD THE CHINESE COMRADES HAVE ACTED?

If they reached the conclusion that grave mistakes have been proved in the line of their party, the party should have corrected them and needed a new congress to define its line. The congress should have been prepared, hence the party should have been prepared, in the first place, because only the party can and must correct everything.

1 — This means, first of all, that the Plenum of the Central Committee should have thoroughly analysed the line, the mistakes, the collective and individual responsibilities, the measures and the orientations.

2 — All this profound analysis of the party by the leadership should have been taken for discussion to the whole party, right down to the branches, and everyone from top to bottom should have been shaken up. Radical measures should have been taken, suggestions and proposals made, resulting in resolutions. The revisionists, their methods of thinking, acting and organization, should have been mercilessly exposed and any resistance on their part smashed.

3 — During this great work the organizations of the communist youth, the trade-unions and the front should have been mobilized, and if it were necessary, the «Red Guard» set up for any eventuality.

After the line had been purged, after the revisionist elements and groupings in the party and in the leadership had been purged, after new leaders, resolute and loyal to Marxism-Leninism had been elected, they should have:

a) purged the state apparatus of enemies, revisionists, bureaucrats, and done away with any line which supported the capitalists, any form of work, any privilege, or any resistance from them;

b) accompanied all this work with a general mobilization to carry out the economic plans, to strengthen revolutionary vigilance and the defence of the country;

c) finally, made a proper clean up, and gone to the 9th Congress with multiplied strength, with the party purified and steeled and with Marxist-Leninist unity.

Otherwise, **to leave the party in passivity and uncertainty, to dictate to it what it should do and what it should not do through the student «Red Guard», or the directives of a Central Committee which is not united, cannot result in anything sound. The line of the masses does not mean «the line of the market-places and the streets». The party must understand, apply and direct that line, otherwise it does not give sound results.**

We do not know whether the Chinese comrades have pursued a line of work with the party on this major question. We see only that the «Red Guard» is attacking party committees, leaders, and so on. The «Red Guard» has been told to attack them, but is this being done after a proper party analysis, and the enemy put with their backs to the wall? This we do not know.

Time will make clear to us the forms and methods which the Chinese comrades are using and the results they will yield. This will be a «new experience», but we hope that this experience of theirs will put an end to this great hostile activity which has been discovered in fraternal China.

FRIDAY
OCTOBER 28, 1966

IT IS UP TO OUR PARTIES TO CONCRETIZE OUR LINKS WITH THE MARXIST-LENINIST MOVEMENT

Today, at the premises of the Central Committee of the Party, I received the delegation of the Communist Party of China, comprised of Kang Sheng, Member of the Political Bureau and the Secretariat of the CC of the CP of China, Li Hsien-nien, Member of the Political Bureau and the Secretariat of the CC of the CP of China, etc., which has come to our country to take part in the proceedings of the 5th Congress of the PLA.

After speaking about the militant friendship between our two countries and parties, about the political-economic situation of the country and the high revolutionary spirit in the Party, I dwelt on the stand which we must maintain and on the relations which we should have with the Marxist-Leninist communist parties, with the objective that those things which we shall put forward to the Congress, and which I have more or less formulated as theses in this diary (October 10 — Theses about the Unity of the International Marxist-Leninist Movement), will not come as a surprise to them.

Our aim was to urge the Chinese comrades somewhat to activize themselves in the support of the new Marxist-Leninist parties. In connection with this question, in general I said these things:

On the occasion of our Congress, we have invited delegations from all the Marxist-Leninist communist parties,

old and new, which stand in correct Marxist-Leninist positions, have also invited representatives from the Marxist-Leninist revolutionary movement and groups. Some of the latter we have invited as observers. We think that this is of great assistance to our Party, and we value their coming and the aid they will give us very highly. We think, also, that this will serve our great common aim: the strengthening of the international unity of Marxist-Leninists, of their parties and groups, in our great struggle against imperialists and the modern revisionist renegades.

We shall certainly have bilateral or trilateral discussions with them, with the aim of jointly exchanging opinions and experience. This, we think, will be very fruitful for our movement, which will make a further step forward.

Of course, many comrades will want to meet and talk with you, the delegation of the Communist Party of China, too. We consider your eventual meetings and talks with them of great importance to the revolutionary movement. For our part, we shall put everything at your disposal, give you every facility you require, so that your contacts and talks with them will be completely successful.

Like you and us, the comrades of the sister parties and the Marxist-Leninist groups will certainly express their opinions and proposals on the common problems of the movement, perhaps also on their own special internal problems.

We shall be profoundly responsive to the trust they will show in our Party, shall devote our full attention to their ideas and proposals and do whatever is possible to assist them with our modest forces.

But we feel it an internationalist duty and in the interest of strengthening our internationalist unity to have frequent exchanges and co-ordination of opinions with you, in connection with the problems and eventual requests of

the comrades of the sister parties. We trust that you have no opposition to this.

We think that it is up to us, to both your big party and our Party, in the first place, to take the first steps to concretize closer, more effective links with the whole world Marxist-Leninist movement, so that our Marxist-Leninist unity is further tempered and our joint activity against our common enemies is strengthened.

We think, in particular, that the time has come for our Marxist-Leninist parties to develop the most appropriate and fruitful different working contacts. We are not putting forward this important problem for solution now, on the occasion of our Congress. No. We put this problem forward to Comrade Chou En-lai when he visited our country, and are putting it forward to you again. We should be happy to exchange opinions with you on this problem, but if necessary, and when your party finds it appropriate, we are ready to send a party delegation to Peking especially to discuss this question.

It seems to us that this problem is important, and it is necessary to discuss and concretize it even in preliminary rudimentary forms, because the modern revisionists and their capitalist patrons have devoted all their demagogic and economic strength, pressure and blackmail to hitting hard at any strengthening of our internationalist Marxist-Leninist unity, to attacking the movement from within, through ideological diversion, and from outside, through isolation.

The modern revisionists are making every effort, every attempt, to penetrate even our recognized, monolithic, revolutionary parties loyal to Marxism-Leninism with their revisionist ideology. One can imagine what they are doing and will do with the new Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary groups. We have a major duty to assist our com-

rades in these parties, which have still not properly consolidated their positions, with all our forces and means.

We have also invited delegations from the Korean Workers' Party, the Communist Party of Japan, etc., to our Congress. We have sent invitations to a number of parties, saying that, if it is impossible for them to send a delegation, let them send us a greeting.

We maintain relations with a number of socialist countries, and have not engaged in open polemics with them, with the stands and views of the parties of these countries. As you know, not only are we not in agreement, but we are in struggle with many of their revisionist views, and in the Report to the Congress, as you will see, we attack these views of theirs, assailing them from the angle of principle, without mentioning any party or person by name.

This we do, for instance, with Rumania, the Communist Party of which has attacked us openly. You know our views on this party, because we have talked with comrades of your party several times and expressed our opinion about the anti-Marxist stands and demagogy of the leadership of the Communist Party of Rumania.

A year ago, if I am not mistaken, we had contact with a delegation of the Communist Party of Japan, which had come to our country for a holiday. We organized a meeting and exchanged opinions with the Japanese comrades. At this meeting we expressed our views openly. They were somewhat reserved, but fully approved the views of our Party. After this meeting, we see, but still not very clearly, that the line of the Communist Party of Japan has undergone changes to the right, which are not good. For what reason?! If it is possible, we would like you to tell us something about the ideo-political stands of the Communist Party of Japan.

In regard to the Korean Workers' Party, we have

had scarcely any party contacts with it. We have not been in agreement with its equivocal stand towards Khrushchev and Khrushchevite revisionism, and our doubts have not been without foundation. The recent stands of the Korean comrades confirm that they are in contradiction with us over principles on many questions. They have adopted an equivocal, centrist, opportunist line. But, if it is possible, we would also like you to explain to us, in regard to the Korean Workers' Party, what were the objective and subjective reasons that made the Korean comrades slip into these positions.

I shall not extend on the development of the conversation, which must be in the minutes in the Central Committee Archives.

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 10, 1966

KANG SHENG'S EXPLANATIONS

Yesterday we had a meeting with Comrade Kang Sheng, who gave us some supplementary explanations about the Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China which were additional to the talks of our delegation with Comrade Mao in May, and our talks with Comrade Chou En-lai the last time he was in our country.

From Comrade Kang Sheng's exposition it emerges that there were deep ideo-political differences in the main leadership of the Communist Party of China. There were two, or better, three groups: the group of Mao, that of Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, and a third group of Peng Chen, Lu Ting-yi, Lo Jui-tsin, etc.

Comrade Kang Sheng described Peng Chen as an enemy and disguised agent who had betrayed as early as 1925. Investigations about him are continuing. Peng Chen, with his associates Lu Ting-yi, Lo Jui-tsin, etc., were revisionists, bourgeois capitalist agents who plotted to usurp power in China. Of course, they had a network of their people everywhere, at the centre and at the base, and no doubt in the army, too, but Kang Sheng did not go deeply into these things. **Thus, it turns out that the danger was real and very serious.**

Meanwhile, the Chinese comrades described Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping as elements with bourgeois capitalist views, not on the scale of the group of Peng

Chen, who had violated Mao's directive which they, too, had jointly accepted, but had acted in «the working groups and with white terror», trying to suppress the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. Kang Sheng said, «These two comrades, although stubborn, recognized their mistakes and made self-criticism, in writing and orally, to the extended Central Committee of the Party and remained on the Standing Committee of the Political Bureau.»

According to Comrade Kang Sheng's exposition, Liu's group opposed Mao's line of the masses and attempted to smother this line. It turns out, also, that the «Red Guard» «was created as a further development of the line of the masses in the exposure of the activity of Peng Chen and company».

He said no more in this direction and did not imply that there were other differences in the leadership. However, I think that, from the general spirit of the exposition, it emerges that this Cultural Revolution is not only cultural, but is also political, as we have thought. Thus, the Chinese comrades, without saying so, are trying to correct many political, organizational, economic, educational and other mistakes through the Cultural Revolution.

Comrade Kang Sheng did not mention the role of the «Red Guard» at all, but only the role of «the party and Mao in this revolution». After Kang Sheng had spoken, in my reply I thanked him and started an exposition of our view on this problem of theirs. Thus, we avoided the questions that we could have asked and, in an indirect way, **dwelling on our experience, affirmed a number of basic principles, such as the role of the party in everything, the development of the class struggle, the maintenance of high vigilance in the leadership, the purging of the party leadership of enemy and suspect elements, the refusal in any way to accept a line of «coexistence with the ca-**

pitalists» (an allusion to the theses of their 8th Congress), etc.

Comrade Kang Sheng fully accepted our exposition and unity was complete. He was very happy about this, and so were we. Could the Chinese comrades have told us more extensively about their internal problems, and especially, more extensively about the wrong theses of Teng Hsiao-ping and Liu Shao-chi, whose mistakes we think do not consist only in the «working groups»? We think that they could have talked to us more extensively. But we could not insist on this matter at any greater length.

However, we are very happy when we are told that the correct Marxist-Leninist line has triumphed, because otherwise it would have been a catastrophe for China and the international communist movement. **We had a correct view and remain unshaken on the issues of principle on the great Chinese problem. We stressed to the Chinese comrades, too, that both we and they, must always carry matters through to the end and radically purge the rotten things, regardless of what forms have to be used.**

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 14, 1966

THE EVENTS IN CHINA ARE BEING EXPLAINED TO US

From all the different talks which we had with Comrade Kang Sheng, almost everything which is occurring in China has been made clear to us. The explanations which Kang Sheng gave us on the specific recommendation of Mao were very necessary and useful. Mao had told Kang Sheng when he left to visit us: **«Tell the Albanian comrades all about this, because they are certainly very worried about our problem, for they are our closest comrades».**

Summing up all the explanations which Kang Sheng gave us, it turns out that we were right to be worried and to postulate many possible hypotheses with the few facts we had.

The main question for us, which was to explain nearly all the problems of the development of events in China, was that of unity in the leadership, the disagreements which existed in its ranks and what they consisted of. What view did one and the other defend and how were these differences solved?

We had not the slightest doubt that there were deep differences within the leadership of the Communist Party of China, but what they were, and who was wrong, was not completely clear to us. In regard to Peng Chen and his group, this matter had also been explained to us by

Comrade Chou En-lai, but not in its full extent, including the great danger that this group posed. Beyond this we knew nothing, but from outside we saw that there were others, and especially Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, about whom little was said, except that a few dazibaos went up and were later removed. Above all, we saw that in the list of leaders there were alterations in the ranking of individuals. This created confusion for us, because they had presented these comrades to us as «among the best», as «Marxist-Leninists loyal to Mao's line». Then suddenly, one morning, these comrades came out on another road, «the reactionary capitalist road», and were attacked.

Quite rightly we asked: What is going on? When our delegation was in China in May, Mao himself told our comrades, in the presence of Teng Hsiao-ping: «Look at Teng Hsiao-ping, he is short and perhaps does not catch the eye, but he is a good capable comrade», etc.

The existence of the group of Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping in opposition to Mao's line, and taking into account their position and prestige in the party and among the people, made the problem even more complicated and dangerous. These two comrades distorted the decisions taken jointly and collectively with Mao about the methods of carrying out the Cultural Revolution, and took organizational measures, up to terror, to divert this revolution from its true objectives and to strangle it. In the light of this situation, all the measures and the development of the Cultural Revolution, the actions of the «Red Guard», the dazibaos, articles, etc., are explained. Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping were compelled to acknowledge their mistakes before the extended Central Committee and to make self-criticism orally and in writing. Hence the situation was extremely critical and dangerous.

Kang Sheng did not tell us any more, but following our questions he admitted, agreeing with our opinion, that

the 8th Congress, Liu Shao-chi's report to this Congress and the resolution, had many mistakes in line.

On the question of the «anti-imperialist front including even the revisionists», he said that this was not the opinion or the decision of the Central Committee, hence he implied that it was the idea of Liu Shao-chi and Chou En-lai, because it was they who put it forward to them.

In regard to going to Moscow after the fall of Khrushchev, he said that this had been Mao's idea, and added: «You (Albanians) were completely right and did well not to go to Moscow».

As a conclusion it emerges that all those actions were carried out and all those measures were taken, with their good points and their excesses, in the face of this serious danger which was threatening the party and the dictatorship of the proletariat in China.

We are sticking to our opinion in regard to the cult of the individual and certain methods of work which are considered «suitable» in China, as well as the *excès** of the «Red Guard». But with all those things that were occurring in China, these excesses were likely to occur. Here we must see the great purpose, the reason why it is done. This is important and is positive. Why did they not do it in the way we thought they should? Perhaps the Chinese comrades thought that the danger of the hostile work had been overcome without the need to arouse the party, the working class, and the people.

On the other hand, we are a hundred per cent opposed to it that Lin Piao has written an article, if this is true, in which he puts Mao above Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin, and calls Marxism-Leninism «obsolete».

Hence a deep-going dangerous hostile activity against the party and socialism has been exposed in China and measures have been taken for its liquidation. **But we think**

---

* Excess (French in the original).

that the measures against these enemies are not radical. We do not know the problems in detail, but we cannot understand how enemies like Peng Chen live in villas, have cars, receive salaries, and above all, are even kept in the leadership! This is scandalous. We would have brought such criminals to trial, and a court would have sentenced them to the punishment which their dangerous traitor activity warranted.

This serious internal hostile work develops and becomes threatening at a time when the American imperialists, in alliance with the Soviet revisionists, are threatening China with war and preparing to encircle it with fire, with armies.

Struggle against imperialism, struggle against modern revisionism, headed by Soviet revisionism, struggle to defend the purity of Marxism-Leninism, this is our line and we shall defend it even at the cost of our blood.

Comrade Kang Sheng and the comrades of the delegation of the Communist Party of China, who came to our 5th Congress, saw these views and our correct Marxist-Leninist decisions manifested with the greatest force not only in the conference hall, but everywhere among the broad masses of the people, wherever they went. They were very moved, deeply touched and enthused. The steel unity achieved **on the Marxist-Leninist road** between our two parties has been tempered and we shall struggle to temper it more.

FRIDAY
DECEMBER 9, 1966

CONCLUSIONS ON THE BASIS OF FACTS

As is emerging, the long-range forecasts of our Party in connection with the line of the Communist Party of China are being confirmed.

In a form of self-criticism, the Chinese comrades say that they had underrated Titoism and modern revisionism when they emerged, and they saw the danger of them when the Khrushchevites seized the reins of the Bolshevik Party and the Soviet state.

However, on the basis of the Chinese official documents, we think they saw the Khrushchevite revisionism and its full danger when they began the open struggle against them and lined up publicly with our Party. Before this they were asleep, and this is proved by their 8th Congress, by their attitude at the Moscow Meeting in 1957, and also by their hesitation to take a clear-cut stand when Khrushchev openly attacked our Party. Now the zigzags and hesitations in the anti-revisionist stands of the Chinese comrades in that period are understandable. The camouflaged Chinese revisionists strove in every possible way to restrain the polemic, since it was impossible to extinguish it.

The resolute Marxist-Leninist stand of our Party has helped the Chinese comrades to see things more clearly. We must come to the conclusion that Mao and some of his comrades, while being in opposition to the Khrush-

chevite revisionists on a number of questions earlier, have now realized not only the full treachery of these revisionists but also the mistaken aspect of the line they have followed towards the Khrushchevites as well as the activity of the revisionist elements within the Communist Party of China.

This must have been the starting point for the class struggle within the leadership of the Communist Party of China, between those who were with Mao Tsetung and followed his line, and the revisionist group with Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, Peng Chen, etc., a struggle which gradually assumed wider proportions, a fiercer character, and is still going on. Many activities of the Chinese revisionists for the «anti-imperialist front including even the revisionists», etc., are linked with this period. The tactical period of the Khrushchevites who brought down Khrushchev and allegedly did not engage in polemics with us is also understood. Without doubt, with these manoeuvres they intended to assist their comrades, the Chinese revisionists, to enable them to continue to operate more quietly in order to organize the seizure of power in China and to liquidate or neutralize Mao, because, in a revolutionary situation, the Chinese revisionists would have been exposed, as they were exposed in fact.

Now that Mao Tsetung and the Communist Party of China have unmasked the Chinese revisionist traitors and their conspiracy, the modern revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, and their loyal allies, the American imperialists, have begun their anti-Chinese, anti-Marxist, anti-Leninist campaign even more furiously, because their plot has failed, because their Chinese friends have been exposed and isolated and their hopes of seizing power in China have gone down the drain. Indeed, the Soviet, Hungarian, and other revisionists, are openly defending

their routed comrades in Peking at their congresses. This must be considered a victory not only for China, but also for us and the international communist movement.

In specific conditions, the forms of mass revolutionary struggle can have their own importance in raising the consciousness of the masses and in the education of revolutionary younger generations, and can be used, of course not in a stereotyped manner, by the Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries:

First, in those countries and in those parties where the modern revisionists are in power.

Second, in those socialist countries and in those parties where the revisionists have or have not state power in their hands, but act under disguise, or steer a so-called middle course.

Third, in the new Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary groups which fight both against the revisionists of their own countries and the capitalist-revisionist system.

Of course, our Party learns from the development of the present events in China and from the experience, even when it is bitter, of the Communist Party of China.

The consistent Marxist-Leninist line applied by our Party in regard to Titoism, the Khrushchevites and modern revisionism, imperialism and all the enemies, in a word, the stern waging of the class struggle both at home and in the international arena has protected the Party, and our people and kept them pure, militant and revolutionary.

We must advance courageously on this road; **let the bitter and positive experience serve us continuously to enrich our own experience, so that dangers would never threaten our Party, our people, and our Homeland.**

FRIDAY
DECEMBER 30, 1966

THE CONTINUATION OF THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA

The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China continues and certainly it has to continue and become ever sharper to root out the noxious weeds which have sprouted and may sprout later on the road to socialism in China. This is important for us and for all the Marxist-Leninists. We have supported and will support the correct orientation of this Chinese Cultural Revolution, because it is attacking the bourgeois-capitalist-revisionist line of a group of Chinese leaders headed by Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, Peng Chen, Peng Teh-huai, Lo Jui-tsin, Lu Ting-yi and many others.

The fact is that officially, a final verdict on this group has not been passed by the Central Committee of the Party, as far as we know. Probably it has to be an internal measure. Nevertheless, I think that this is not sufficient. As we know, for we have been told about Peng Chen, Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, the latter two have made self-criticism orally and in writing. We have been told also that these two have opposed the line of «working groups of the party», which were sent by them to attack the Cultural Revolution. And that's the end of it! But is it? Many dazibaos against Liu and Teng are still going up. These demand «their removal, their liquidation», but say no more.

We think that their mistakes cannot consist only of what is being said, but include all those deep reasons which impelled them to act to prevent the carrying out of the Cultural Revolution. And these reasons are the essence, the basis, of their mistakes. If we take as a basis the main orientations of the Cultural Revolution, which are against imperialism, against capitalism, against modern revisionism, for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, socialism, the dictatorship of the proletariat, the class struggle, and the line of the masses, the hostility of this group with Liu Shao-chi at the head becomes obvious. But it is correct that the mistakes, or the treachery of these people, should be stated openly, so that friends and comrades can judge the issue correctly, so as to strengthen and provide even better arguments for their solidarity in struggle.

There is no doubt that mistakes have been proved in the line of the Communist Party of China and that these mistakes had been left to get worse. To what extent one or the other has made mistakes, we cannot judge, but from the current activities it seems as if the mistakes in line are being gradually corrected, and we come to the supposition that the group of Liu Shao-chi has been mostly to blame for these mistakes and that it is putting up resistance to the struggle for the liquidation of these mistakes.

We are at a loss how to understand the tactic of not speaking openly about these mistakes in line and about the main culprits. **In similar cases with us we have done such a thing openly, the Party has been told the «whys» and «wherefores» and has fully supported the leadership. It has given the communists full information about the matter. But with us the subversive or open struggle of enemies has never been allowed to solidify. Our revolution has been continuous, the struggle against open**

and secret enemies of the Party and the people has never ceased.

One is obliged to think that in China this hostile work had been ignored for a long time and bad consolidated itself. Under the banner of «Mao Tsetung thought» and the «general line of the party and the Central Committee», both enemies and non-enemies acted according to this line. The enemies went about their work, and the good people never troubled their minds about it. When their eyes opened, apparently a new tactic of struggle to liquidate this enemy work has been thought out. It is precisely this tactic that the group of Liu has opposed, because this tactic would have liquidated it. Perhaps another «normal» tactic in an abnormal situation would have allowed the hostile work to continue and would have become dangerous.

Now we see that the Cultural Revolution is being extended to the factories, among the working class. This means that there, too, many things have to be put in order, many people have to be purged, and many ideas and actions have to be corrected. From there, undoubtedly, the revolution will go on to the countryside, and the long marches of the «red guards» are preparing this. Little by little, this whole revolution is coming within the norms that we considered at its start. Now it seems that the enemy groups are being exposed and liquidated, and at the same time, work is being done to correct the mistakes.

The Soviet revisionists had pinned great hopes on their comrades, the Chinese revisionists, and now that they are under attack, the Soviets are taking them openly under their protection and calling on them to rise against Mao. This is a life and death struggle, and the Chinese comrades must understand this and carry it through to

the end. **If they continue to maintain soft, opportunist stands towards the enemies such as they have done up to now, then this is a flash in the pan. This means to imply to the enemy that he should save himself in order to take power later, because, faced with defeat, the enemies are changing tactics, «repenting», «making sincere self-criticism», cheering: «Long live Mao!», and similiar manoeuvres.**

The revolution must not be left off half-way; if you begin it you must carry it through to the end. We must be merciless towards the enemies of the party, the people, Marxism-Leninism and the revolution.

1967

TUESDAY
JANUARY 3, 1967

READING AN ARTICLE ABOUT THE PROLETARIAN CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA

On the occasion of the New Year, the newspaper «Renmin Ribao» published a long article on the Chinese Proletarian Cultural Revolution. I read the summary of it Hsinhua gave. This article appears to present the main objectives and orientations of this revolution in a concentrated way, and this it does in a more balanced manner, avoiding exaltations and hyperbole to some extent.

After so many months, it is becoming clear that what has been achieved up till now has not been easy, and as it seems, the final victory is still not easy, although it is certain that the greatest resistance of the revisionists in China has been crushed. However, **since the main revisionists have not been purged from the important positions they occupy, notwithstanding the fact that they are isolated or remain in these positions formally, still it is a weakness if Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping remain for a long time in the functions they have. Their being in the positions which they hold encourages the resistance of elements which support them at the base.** They must not only be exposed with dazibaos, as at present, but must also be brought down.

Why is this not being done? **If the old tactic is going to be continued, then this is a major mistake and things will**

go badly. If «they are still strong», then what are the Chinese comrades waiting for, why do they not strike them a lightning blow, but allow the affair to drag on endlessly? Even if «they have made self-criticism», still they must be by all means kicked out from the positions which they occupy at present.

However, to remove them, and especially to remove Liu Shao-chi from the post of President, the Central Committee of the Party, the General Assembly, and so on, have to meet. As practice shows, the Chinese comrades are afraid of meetings, although when they hold them they carry them on for a month or more.

However, this time it is necessary to go deeply into matters, to disclose the many real causes in order to gain a thorough knowledge of the mistakes of the Liu Shao-chi group. The party must make these analyses in the first place, that is, those party norms which I have stated in my early notes on this matter, should be implemented. **It cannot fail to strike the eye that in their article many matters are now presented differently, and the opinions expressed by us, whether in articles, at the 5th Congress, or in talks, especially with Comrade Kang Sheng, have not fallen on deaf ears.**

I have the impression that the Chinese comrades were, or found themselves, unable to act in the way we thought they should, but now that they have recovered themselves to some extent, they have carried out some purges and exposures, have better control of the situation and continue to strengthen their position, thus everything is heading for normalization. As I have said in other notes, they had to use new tactics, and these were not fortuitous and spontaneous but well-considered.

I cannot agree with the Chinese comrades on the question of Stalin, either. They blacken the work of Stalin. On this question of principle they are not objective and are

not completely on the Marxist course. The Chinese comrades are still judging Stalin according to their opportunist views.

In this article, too, they neglect and almost totally «overlook» the great principled struggle which Stalin waged against opportunists, rightists, Trotskyites, Bukharinites, etc. He waged this struggle in difficult conditions against internal and external enemies of the Soviet Union, against those who did everything in their power to restore capitalism in the Soviet Union. Was this a minor struggle?! Was this a minor experience?!

Stalin fought resolutely against secret and open enemies until the day he died. And after the war, what was the question of Leningrad? What were the reforms in the Central Committee and the bringing into the leadership of a large number of new people? What was the meaning of the condemnation of Zhukov about whom it came out later what he was? What was the removal of Kosygin, who also showed himself for what he was? What was the significance of Khrushchev's statement that Stalin did not trust them and told them, «You will capitulate to imperialism»? And everything that Stalin said turned out true.

These are a few isolated things which we know, but if we have full knowledge of Stalin's activity after the Second World War then we will see his titanic Marxist-Leninist greatness more clearly.

Our Party benefited from the teachings of Stalin, followed them faithfully, and therefore it did not go wrong. It is for this reason that those things which are occurring in China today do not occur in Albania. What the Communist Party of China is doing today by means of the Cultural Revolution our Party has long been doing, continuously, consistently, step by step, in a revolutionary manner, and with quality.

It is not right at all that, in order to boost oneself,

the major role of Stalin, who fought with great consistency, should be blackened; it is not at all Marxist to appropriate to oneself what other Marxist-Leninist parties have done and are doing consistently. But the Chinese comrades might say: «See, the fact is that in the Soviet Union the revisionists seized power». Yes, this is a bitter fact, however, the revisionists seized power there after the death of Stalin. Why did they not take it while he was alive?

Let us suppose that Stalin «had not been vigilant» and «had not taken preventive measures», then why did it take you Chinese comrades, who criticize Stalin, ten to fourteen years on end to see through Khrushchev, eighteen years on end Tito, and at least sixteen years the groups of Liu Shao-chi and Peng Chen? And you had the great revolutionary experience of Lenin and Stalin and the bitter experience of Tito, Khrushchev, Kao Gang, Wang Ming, etc.

No, no! Stalin was a great man, a great revolutionary, a great Marxist-Leninist, and so will he remain through the centuries. The mistakes of Stalin, if they exist, are minor ones. And to list them you must find them, and when you find them you must judge them in the circumstances of the time.

Liu Shao-chi, this revisionist, had delivered a whole report to the comrades of one of our delegations about the alleged rightist mistakes of Stalin, alleging that Stalin had said that the class struggle was over, etc. What irony! And who was saying this? The person who, at the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China, advocated coexistence with the capitalists! Liu Shao-chi emerged as the Chinese Khrushchev!

Or Chou En-lai comes to us and delivers a whole report in order to convince us that Stalin «made major mistakes» in regard to the Chinese! And when did he

deliver this report? Precisely at a time when in China the anti-Stalinists, the Chinese revisionists, were plotting to seize state power!

No, these things do not go down with us. These views of the Chinese comrades are wrong and must be corrected, because they are on major questions of principle. The revolution, whether the «great revolution», or even this «Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution», cannot make progress without understanding Stalin correctly, without defending Stalin and his work, without the ideas of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Now the Chinese are also adding those of Mao to them.

Well, it is your business: call Mao «great». But he can never be compared with Stalin. Stalin was truly great and Lenin even greater.

SATURDAY
JANUARY 7, 1967

THE STRUGGLE AGAINST REVISIONISTS IN CHINA WILL BE PROTRACTED

The question of China has colossal importance for the international communist movement, therefore we are following the events which are taking place there with the greatest attention, trying to see and analyse them as correctly as possible, to make different suppositions, the accuracy or inaccuracy of which we can verify by means of concrete facts and data, to build up other suppositions, and to verify them again and again.

We are deeply conscious of our responsibility in regard to these major problems. For us they have a colossal threefold importance: First, **we should profit to the maximum and in the most correct way from the good experience and from the mistakes of the Communist Party of China,** second, **we should assist the Communist Party of China to the maximum with our correct stands; and third, our correct well-considered and mature stands should also assist the international communist movement.**

The Cultural Revolution in China is developing successfully and the exposure of revisionist elements, and in the first place, of Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, Peng Chen, Lo Jui-tsin, etc., is increasing and assuming wide proportions. As it seems, the campaign against them is being deepened and has made great strides forward from the time when Kang Sheng told us: «They have made self-

criticism», «the faults of Liu, Teng and others are not of the same order as those of Peng Chen». This deepening of the exposure is good, although, in our opinion, it is insufficient; however, that is another matter.

Apart from this, from what we can learn and read, it turns out that serious dazibaos have also emerged about many other leaders, such as Chen Yi, Li Hsien-nien, and especially Chen Po-ta, and fewer about Chu Teh and Chou En-lai (?), etc. It must be admitted that all these dazibaos, with the exception of some that might have been put up by some provocateur elements, or supporters of the revisionist group, have been inspired from above, organized by various cadres on the basis of analyses of mistakes in line. It is also a fact that there is a change from the first phase in which, when a dazibao went up about some main leader, it was removed immediately, and the authors were told «to address themselves to the Central Committee». This again indicates the further deepening of the Cultural Revolution and of the criticism of the mistakes, the deepening of proletarian democracy and democratic centralism, and that Comrade Mao and his comrades are taking the situation more strongly in hand each year.

The resistance of the modern revisionists is being broken, being crushed. The Cultural Revolution is mounting, it is extending among the ranks of the working class, the peasantry, the army, the youth and the intelligentsia. Is there still danger? As far as we can judge, we cannot say that the danger has been completely eliminated, the enemy may attempt a desperate last act before death, or may try to avoid the crushing blow, by keeping a low profile till the storm blows over. **Thus even after the final victory, that is, after the routing of the revisionists, in our opinion, the struggle against them in China will be protracted, stern and consistent; otherwise, if it proceeds**

on the opportunist line of «education and re-education», there are great dangers. The struggle against the class enemy must be merciless, not a struggle on paper and with words, but a real struggle with deeds.

There are rumours that recently some dazibaos have gone up which say, «Mao has been isolated or pushed aside by the Liu Shao-chi group», «Mao has been placed in the minority, and a decision for a certain by-passing of him, from the time he withdrew from the post of President of the Republic and was replaced by Liu, was taken for reasons of health, old age», etc. All these things are very interesting, but we must wait for them to be verified, because they throw light on many capital questions, and first of all, on the mistakes in the line of the party.

Without going any further back, from the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China, the line set must have been decided jointly, hence Mao, too, has his responsibility in the mistakes. A new dazibao says that Comrade Mao made self-criticism at the 11th Plenum of the Central Committee.

Then, on the basis of these few facts and those reliable data which we had earlier, it turns out that there was a certain pushing aside of Mao from leadership. (When Liri Belishova returned from China and was brainwashed in Moscow by Kozlov, amongst other things, she told Hysni, «You see, the Chinese, too, have put Comrade Mao on the sidelines — they do not want to get him involved in these disagreements with the Soviets, therefore we, too, should act in this way with Comrade Enver». (!) Or Lo Jui-tsin himself told our ambassador in Peking, «Comrade Mao is old now, we must not tire him, therefore we have advised him to rest, and do not worry him, Chou En-lai leads us».) To what extent has Mao been pushed aside? How? Since when? We cannot determine these things at the moment. But this could be true, both about Mao

and about Lin Piao, who, they always tell us, «is very ill».

In fact, then, Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, Chou En-lai, Cheng Yi, Lo Jui-tsin, etc., were leading the party, the state and the army. Mao may have been asked about some things, but when it came to implementing his instructions, who knows what fate they have had, while the others were operating actively and, in fact, had seized power in their hands. Mao must have been in opposition over many things, and regardless of these conditions, his isolation, etc., he must have seen clearly the sinister actions of these enemies and should not have remained idle.

Apparently, the group of Liu Shao-chi had been avoiding the meeting of the party congress and the meetings of the plenums of the Central Committee for so many years on end, because otherwise the «struggle would have broken out». Thus, things were run in groups and not collectively, in the party way. This could account for Mao's being put in the minority, his isolation, in order to avoid providing the possibility for a confrontation of ideas in the proper way and the analysis of the line. The revisionists avoided this analysis in the party way. Apparently they feared the possible consequences and Mao's authority. As Kang Sheng told us, things had gone so far that even an article by Mao criticizing a play was not published in the press, although he sent it to Peking for publication.

If we pursue the logic of these facts, it emerges that the revisionists have had the power in China in their hands. There is no other way to explain the vacillating stand of the Chinese comrades towards the Khrushchevites; the vacillating stand of Peng Chen in Bucharest; the passive stand on their part for years on end in regard to the defence of our Party; their insisting, on the one hand, that Khrushchev cease the polemics against us, and on the other hand, the pressures exterted on us over

the provision of credits, as Chou En-Lai did, or Liu Shao-chi, who said to our ambassador in China: **«How long will this polemic continue? It cannot go on for ever!»; or the thesis that, «we do not attack the Khrushchevites by name, since they do not do such a thing to us either»**; or the support they give Aidit and the praise they lavish on him «for his Marxist-Leninist line»; or their declarations, «we do not meddle in the affairs of the Korean Workers' Party», although it maintained a non-Marxist-Leninist stand; or «the line of the anti-imperialist front even with the revisionists», ardently defended by Liu Shao-chi and Chou En-lai, and energetically combated by us, about which when we pointed this out to Kang Sheng, he told us openly that «the anti-imperialist front together with the revisionists is not the line of Mao Tsetung»; finally Chou En-lai's going with such zeal and great hopes to Moscow after the fall of Khrushchev, where Malinovsky said to him openly: **«Whai are you waiting for? Why don't you overthrow Mao, too, as we did Khrushchev», etc., etc.**

All these and other things show that the Liu Shao-chi group had taken power and was making every effort to reach a compromise with the Khrushchevite revisionists. But the struggle waged by the Party of Labour of Albania, the resistance of Mao and the Chinese Marxist-Leninists around him, the fear of being completely exposed, made the revisionist group of Liu lose ground and hindered its plans and tactics.

It is not a lack of modesty if we claim that our Party has played the decisive role in the struggle against modern revisionism, and in fact, has been the only party in struggle with the modern revisionists, open and disguised. The Communist Party of China, when it was in the hands of Liu Shao-chi, was compelled by the persistent struggle of our party to enter the struggle against Khrushchevite revisionism, but it did so reluctantly, until it was put

«on the right track». This moment marked the beginning of the end of the revisionist power of the group of Liu Shao-chi.

As it turns out, all this struggle, in its various aspects, in complicated national and international circumstances, caused the situations prepared by Mao to mature and the Cultural Revolution, the huge broom for sweeping away all filth and enemies, to break out.

Life will verify everything, so that we can strengthen or correct the suppositions and the conclusions we are drawing. We must analyse everything in the light of Marxism-Leninism, because this is important for our general line, important for the strategy and tactics of our Party, the tactics and strategy which must always be far-sighted, correct, based on and enlightened by our Marxist-Leninist theory.

THURSDAY
JANUARY 12, 1967

WE MUST SUPPORT THE CORRECT OBJECTIVES OF THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA

I gave instructions on how we must act in connection with the urgent «Proclamation» of 32 revolutionary organizations of Shanghai. As it seems, the Chinese revisionists began the sabotage activity in the economy of the city of Shanghai. They have taken advantage of the wrong line, have had the committee in their hands, have «coexisted well and beautifully with the capitalists», and now, judging the situation desperate, have set themselves in motion. Of course, they have been encouraged also by the fact that the dictatorship of the proletariat is not striking them as it ought to, that their leaders, such as Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping and other disguised ones, are still not being struck the final blow. The reactionary Chinese bourgeoisie which has infiltrated the party and the state is acting vigorously.

The urgent «Proclamation» of 32 revolutionary organizations of Shanghai has great importance at this stage of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, because now this revolution is going beyond the bounds of dazibaos and the severity of the dictatorship is coming into action. Hence, it has been decided to strike the reactionary elements physically, too, to arrest them, try them and punish them. At last! Perhaps the Chinese comrades arrested reactionary elements before, but in the forms in which they are pres-

enting things now, this is a different kettle of fish. The forms and methods used were such as to give the impression that this revolution would be only «peaceful». You have to be naive to think that the revisionists will fold their arms in the face of this defeat.

Therefore we must publish this urgent «Proclamation» and accompany it with an article in which we defend the correct Marxist-Leninist revolutionary line and, now that we are given the occasion, say openly in the press what we have always thought, namely, that the enemies' heads must be smashed, not just with words, with dazibaos, but even with bullets. The enemy must feel the blow of the dictatorship of the proletariat right to the marrow of its bones.

We must activize our propaganda even more, both at home and abroad, in defence of China, the Communist Party of China, Mao, and the correct objectives of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution. These are decisive moments. Our radio, in its foreign broadcasts, must bring this out loud and clear. Almost every broadcast of our radio in foreign languages must tell the truth about what is occurring in China, in defence of it, and its defence must have the character of an attack from our side against the modern revisionists and the bourgeois propaganda, which are screaming against China in order to deceive world opinion. We have an especially great duty at these moments to propagate the fundamental objectives of the Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China in their true light, and to give them as an example of struggle for the revolutionary Marxist-Leninists in Europe and elsewhere to fight and defeat the revisionist cliques in power.

SUNDAY
JANUARY 15, 1967

THE PARTY IN CHINA WILL STRENGTHEN ITSELF BY RADICALLY CLEANING UP THE MISTAKES IN ITS LINE

The events which occurred in Shanghai and Nanking have been noteworthy events of this month. The strikes and attacks are the result of the hostile work of revisionists and internal reactionaries, who, in complete co-ordination and encouraged and incited by the modem revisionists, headed by the Soviet revisionists, and by the imperialists, who are whipping up an unrestrained slanderous propaganda, have recently tried to rise and to spread the uprising from Shanghai and Nanking throughout China.

Their common aim was to hinder the Cultural Revolution in the ranks of the working class, to confuse the working class and to set it on a course against socialism, against Mao, against the dictatorship of the proletariat, and to make it a tool and a weapon of the counter-revolution. Naturally, this was bound to suffer defeat, as it did, but they tried.

The tactic of the modern revisionists and Chinese internal reaction to divert the working class of Shanghai and Nanking from the Cultural Revolution and to involve it in counter-revolution, as it seems from the press, was to turn the revolution towards economism in order to weaken its political aspect. Speculating with the economic discont-

ent, they urged the workers into strikes against their own state, by paying bribes and increasing pay, by encouraging them to stop work and, under the disguise of marches, or «going to Peking for experience», to hold up transport, damage production and create chaos in the country. Under the cloak of allegedly revolutionary actions, the enemy incited the workers to attack the buildings of «the wealthy», which had been turned into state property, to break into them and establish themselves in them in anarchist style. All these hostile plans were defeated. But this is a great lesson.

This is what it means to go to sleep for a long time, to follow a soft, opportunist line towards class enemies, to fail to implement the Marxist norms in the party in the most rigorous way. During all this time, a period of seventeen years since the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, the opportunist and revisionist elements hid themselves under the label of the line of the party, operated freely for their own aims, in complete tranquility, apparently prepared their cadres and occupied the key positions. These cadres weakened and eroded the party and the leadership. From the base to the centre, the cadres were nearly all theirs. Thus the revisionists did what they wanted, prepared to seize power and to eliminate Comrade Mao and his comrades in the leadership of the party. Now, of course, a great change is being made in the right direction. After all these events, in many places the party must be confused or paralysed. Many leaderships are bad, have been purged and should be purged even more thoroughly. In my opinion, later the whole party must be purged radically of rotten elements, which have wormed their way into its ranks. A reverification of the party must be made, because this is the only way to temper it.

With this mass criticism and self-criticism, which is being done in China now, this aim will be achieved well. This is the road to the consolidation of the party and the People's Republic of China. Had the Chinese comrades done this job earlier, these things would not have occurred.

Here, I think, it is very important that the analysis of situations, the definition of attitudes, the strategy and tactics of the Central Committee of the Party, should be examined from immediately after liberation. Have they all been correct?! Has there been exaggeration of the view about the importance of certain «specific characteristics of China», and has there been a leaning in a number of aspects to liberalism and opportunism? But even if we assume that such a view of things «has been correct judgement» on the basis of the specific circumstances of China, I think that the Chinese comrades did not follow the implementation of the line, the development of the line, and the perfecting of the line from time to time, with a rigorous Marxist-Leninist eye. Naturally, this could have been done if great importance had been placed on the building of the party and the rigorous implementation of its norms. As it now turns out, in fact, importance has not been given to this, and this has been done with definite aims, by the disguised revisionist element within the party. This hindered corrections to the line, and these elements went so far as to reconfirm this course in the whole activity of the party and the state at the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China.

In my opinion, the Communist Party of China operated with slogans, and these were «directives issued from above», by the Central Committee which never met, that is, they were slogans formulated by the group of Liu Shao-chi. Some of these slogans, or most of them, are correct in general, but how they were explained, how they were

applied, and who checked up on them, this is another matter of great importance.

Comrade Mao and the other comrades are faced with a colossal amount of work to do to put the party on the right track, in order to strengthen it, by purging it, in order to straighten out the line, by radically cleaning up the mistakes and deviations in line.

Comrade Mao is doing very well that, in these abnormal situations, he has begun the work to purge and strengthen the party.

In these situations now created in China by the revisionists, we think that the army will and must play a major role in defence of the state. **The army is the weapon of the dictatorship which must always stand ready on the correct Marxist-Leninist road, extremely vigilant against internal and external enemies. The army must always be politically clear, and in order to be politically clear, the party organization in the army must be pure, at a high political and ideological level, and must understand and apply everything, looking at it from this angle alone, the angle of Marxism-Leninism, the angle of the interests of the people and the party. Therefore, it is also essential that the cadres of the army must be loyal to the party, to Marxism-Leninism and the people. In this way alone, the enemy can do nothing, it cannot exist in the army, even if it has some influence, and in this way alone, the army remains truly a weapon of the dictatorship of the proletariat in the hands of the party.**

TUESDAY
JANUARY 17, 1967

MERCILESS STRUGGLE AGAINST ENEMIES

Two articles which I read today written in the main Chinese papers, show that although the situation is not alarming, it is very worrying. In these articles it is explained and admitted that in a number of organs of the party and the state enemy elements hold power and are acting against the revolutionary line by encouraging opposition and arbitrary actions.

But what is even more worrying is the admission that even in the ranks of the army there is resistance, there are army leaders who resist the line of the Cultural Revolution. The two articles call for solidarity, for unity around the party and Mao, to smash the resistance of enemies.

It was impossible that such a thing would not occur, when the line has been opportunist, vacillating for a long time, when efforts have not been made earlier to correct it radically and to attack and counter the enemies long ago. As it seems, Mao was able to react against the «revisionist encirclement» as early as 1962, but not with the necessary severity, and the revisionists prevented the decisions which were taken that year from being applied properly. They sabotaged them.

I am optimistic and convinced that the resistance of the enemies will be crushed, that the party in China will recover. In this situation, the prestige of Mao plays a

decisive role. The Chinese comrades must guard against any evil which the revisionist enemies might hatch up secretely in this situation. If you slacken your vigilance, the enemy attacks you. Therefore, vigilance and merciless struggle all the time against the enemies!

SUNDAY
JANUARY 29, 1967

THE REVISIONISTS IN CHINA AIM TO SEIZE POWER QUIETLY

From the events which are taking place, and which Comrade Hysni will explain to us fully when he returns from China, it turns out that this revolution is, so to say, a revolution which is aimed against a counter-revolution, which had been developing in China over a very long time. Likewise, as it turns out, the camouflaged bourgeois-revisionist elements like Liu Sho-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping, Peng Chen, Lo Jui-tsin, Ho Lung, and others, have been in the leadership, had taken power, made the law, supported the bureaucracy and posed as Marxists.

Likewise, it is becoming clear that there must have been two lines in the Communist Party of China: the line of Mao and that of these revisionists, the bourgeois, reactionary, anti-Marxist line. Mao and the comrades who supported his line must have been in the minority and unable to act to overcome this dangerous situation. This could and must be the situation in general outline, but we cannot define it exactly right without knowing the facts and the dates, when and how such a thing occurred, in what circumstances and how it was developed, who contributed to this situation, how great are the mistakes of one or the other, and to what extent the one or the other contributed in order to overcome this situation or, on the contrary, to strengthen it.

It is also a fact that the majority of these main bad elements had worked systematically to place their men in key positions, to educate and inspire them, and to have everything under control through them, with the exception, apparently, of the army. Of course, the enemies were unable to obscure and openly overthrow the great authority of Mao in the party and amongst the people, and this authority was an insurmountable obstacle. Although he was isolated, and certainly in grave and difficult conditions, Mao still acted.

Apparently, the revisionists had calculated on getting a firm grip on the state power and the party from within quietly, without any fuss, avoiding either political or economic attacks and continuing to cover themselves, for appearance's sake, under the name of Mao. Nevertheless, quietly, without fuss, Liu Shao-chi became President of the Republic, put himself forward, and did not speak a great deal about Mao, or spoke in moderate language, allegedly to avoid falling into the error of «the cult of the individual of Stalin». In this way they intended to overcome the «obstacle of Mao» bit by bit, to put him in the museum of outdated things, where he would either die a natural death from sclerosis, or they would speed up his transition to the «other world».

It would be interesting if an analysis were to be made of the diabolical ways employed by them to place Mao in the minority, of the use of Mao's mistakes or concessions in line (which there certainly must be) in order to strengthen their reactionary positions.

It would also be interesting to know how Mao worked and gave leadership encircled by all these enemies and what his concessions and mistakes in line are. The main thing we want to know is Mao's stand towards these enemies, his «placating» tactic in order to outflank and

overcome these revisionists, is it a temporary tactical stand, or is it his line?

The fact is that at that time Mao found himself in the minority, and the enemy had eroded the party internally, which it seemed had decayed. For this reason he relied on the army in this situation and must have considered that the army would play the decisive role in this revolution. Therefore, the army had to be in his hands, and by this means he had to bring the enemies of socialism and the party to their senses.

It is quite clear that the military fist under the direction of Mao and Lin Piao, was a reality which stood and stands ready behind the Cultural Revolution.

FRIDAY
MARCH 3, 1967

THE DISTORTIONS OF PRINCIPLE IN THE ORGANS OF STATE POWER HAVE RESULTED FROM THE MISTAKES IN LINE

The people's councils, as basic organs of state power in the socialist countries, have their source in the Leninist experience of the Soviets. In our conditions, this experience was adapted to the government of the country and was embraced by the working people. We do not understand why the Chinese comrades are making a series of «experiments» in this direction to find «new forms»?!

It is their business and they may gather their own experience, but I think that, for the present stage of the construction of socialism, this Leninist form of state is the most suitable and based on our Marxist-Leninist principles. We must perfect the state power of the people's councils, must bring it as close as possible to the people, democratize it, elect to it the most revolutionary men of the people, must not allow the administrative apparatuses to become bureaucratic, in a word, the state power of these councils should be the form of the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat, as Lenin and the Leninist experience of our parties teach us.

If the Chinese comrades have allowed the power of their people's councils to fall for a long time under the leadership of revisionist elements, in this way causing

distortions in principle, these must be corrected, because it is not the forms or the principles that are at fault, but the deviations and mistakes in line.

However, it seems that the Chinese comrades are reflecting, are analysing the Cultural Revolution, and coming to conclusions. Now in these recent actions of theirs, we see that they are correcting their mistakes, exaggerations, exalted attitudes, the anarchy, all those phenomena which appeared during the Cultural Revolution and which I have warned of in my earlier notes.

The Chinese comrades are moving towards unification of different trends which have been manifested among the hongweibings (the «red guards») and are purging the leaders in the party and the state. As to how far they are purging the party and in what way they are doing this, we are still not clear. In particular, we still do not see what public measures they are taking about the main wolves, Liu, Teng, Peng Chen, etc. They have told us that they have isolated these people, but officially they remain in their former positions, receive their salaries, and maintain their former privileges. **The Chinese comrades are not handling this thing well. We shall see how they correct it.**

FRIDAY
APRIL 7, 1967

IN CHINA THEY ARE MOVING TOWARDS THE «UNIFICATION» OF THE PARTY WITH THE STATE

It is difficult to draw an accurate conclusion from the information which the Chinese press and radio are giving. One can say only that now the situation there is better than before the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, because in fact, this revolution was launched to overthrow the bourgeois power of the revisionists, which had been established in China under the disguise of the dictatorship of the proletariat. Hence the revolution was raised to overthrow the counter-revolution established over seventeen years. This is the good aspect. But has the counter-revolution been overthrown completely in China? This is not clear, there must still be places where it has not been overthrown, where it is tolerated, because the revolution is still not able to defeat the counter-revolution everywhere.

It seems that the bourgeois-capitalist line in China has not been a superficial phenomenon but very deep-going. The Chinese revisionists had the party, the state, the economy firmly in their grip. The apparatuses and the people were theirs and it was difficult for anyone to hinder them, indeed those who attempted to do so were eliminated. Faced with the Cultural Revolution, the revisionists employed many manoeuvres, tactics and mass co-

unter-attacks. They continue to use legal and illegal forms to resist the revolution.

As far as we can judge from outside, the Chinese comrades must have considered the danger very slight. They thought that the resistance would be weak, and that the dazibaos would be enough to extinguish it. They were obliged to bring in the army later, when reaction attacked with big forces, because they saw that their cadres were being removed from power.

As it seems, however, for the moment only the political exposure of the revisionists and their leaders like Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, is continuing, **and the «original» and ludicrous thing about it is that the official Chinese press is talking about all those political and ideological crimes of Liu Shao-chi, but never mentions his name.** This is truly astonishing! This is reminiscent of those moments when they did not want to mention Khrushchev by name.

But here another question arises: Where was Mao, where were all the other «revolutionary» comrades, when Liu Shao-chi expressed such political and ideological opinions (these are now being printed in the papers), which not one normal capitalist, nor even Hitler and Mussolini in their most ferocious period, expressed, for fear that they would be exposed? Whereas Liu Shao-chi, who has expressed all these ideas, still remains, even if only formally, Vice-Chairman of the Party and President of the Republic.

Another important question, as we understand (or better say, as we do not understand) is that «the party does not exist», but individual communists exist. The Communist Youth does not exist, but many organizations of the «Red Guard» exist; party committees and state organs do not exist, but «revolutionary committees», appointed «by the masses» according to the principle of the «three-in-

one combination», exist. This is the «new form» which emerged from the Cultural Revolution.

As we understand it, they are moving towards the «unification of the party with the state»!!?? This is the «experience of the Cultural Revolution». Some say: «This is a trial», some have made it a *fait accompli*, others are maintaining the structure of the party! The devil alone knows.

I think that this question will take a long time to be cleared up and with half-pie measures, *tâtonnements**, **trial and error, while rejecting the Marxist-Leninist experience gained, it will not be cleared up well, because already opportunist symptoms, softening and fear of the revolutionary masses are apparent.**

The hostile work of the Chinese revisionists, and the lack of truly radical measures for their definite suppression have brought and are bringing great harm to the international communist movement.

---

* Groping in the dark (French in the original).

FRIDAY
APRIL 28, 1967

REFLECTIONS ON THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION. ANARCHY CANNOT BE COMBATED WITH ANARCHY

Of course, from lack of facts we may be mistaken, because in this question, which is such a major one and at the same time so complicated, it is characteristic that we do not find a continuity in the reporting of facts by the Communist Party of China.

The official Chinese press and first of all the newspaper «Renmin Ribao», which is the organ of the Central Committee, reflects this uncertainty, it guards against expressing its real opinion and the analysis of events. Therefore, in place of these things, it writes mostly to prove that «Mao's ideas have always been and are correct», that «Mao has understood everything correctly, he foresees everything correctly, and everyone should follow the teachings of Mao», which are given through quotations and have been filling the newspapers and covering the walls, peoples' bodies and things for the last year. It seems that the Chinese comrades explain events as if they are the outcome of the ideas of Mao, and thus **every article, every note, is directed to convincing people that Mao is a «genius», instead of explaining concretely what is occurring in reality.** This is a serious shortcoming in the presentation of things.

It seems to me, however, that this is not accidental. It represents a chaotic situation and a method of work

and struggle unsuitable for putting things in order. I think, and perhaps I am wrong, that the Cultural Revolution was begun without clear perspectives, the course on which it was to proceed was not defined, and neither the expected nor the unexpected things were foreseen. I think that the general staff of the revolution did not exist. They went into the revolution without the party.

What became of the party? Where is the party? Who led the party? According to information, the party was not in the hands of Mao, others were manoeuvring it. Hence, **the party, as a Marxist-Leninist party, did not come out in revolution and did not lead the revolution.** A few communist cadres, with Mao at the head, led this revolution, but not as a party.

The «Red Guard» rose in revolution, but this was not the party, nor the communist youth organization, nor the trade-union organization, nor the working class. This is a great minus from the angle of principle and organization. The «Red Guard» rose in revolution, but what was it to do, what road was it to follow? I have the impression that this thing was not clear at the start or even later. The «Red Guard» was ordered to demonstrate its strength, its loyalty to the ideas of Mao, to expose the revisionists, and to seize power from them.

Hence, the main question was the question of state power. To struggle to seize power implies that someone is holding this power and is not relinquishing it, therefore you must rise in revolution. Thus, as it turns out, they rose in the revolution to take power without the party at the head, or to put it better, the party had power, but the party was not on the right road.

Was the party on the right road or not? If not, then it should be clearly stated why, what the mistakes consisted of, who had made these mistakes, and how they had to be corrected. If the party was on the right road, why

did it not lead the revolution in fact? If the revisionists are the minority, then why does the party not eliminate them immediately, and especially now that the revolution is being carried out?

These things are not clear, are left obscure; perhaps the revolution will resolve them and make them clear.

I think that the revolution is the most serious thing that can be undertaken, and it does not permit spontaneity, lack of iron discipline, vacillations on principles, anarchy, or confusion. All these things, which should not be allowed, we find in the Chinese Cultural Revolution. Not only have these things not come to an end, but, the way they are going, they will continue for a long time to the detriment of the revolution and socialism in China.

If it does not strike down the leaders of the betrayal, or at least mention them by name, the revolution is not revolution. Without cutting off the heads of a few traitors that deserve it, it is not revolution. If you act as the Chinese comrades are acting, then say no more about the dictatorship of the proletariat, don't speak about the class struggle, because in this case these are words and nothing but words. We do not say that heads should be lopped off for nothing, without grave crimes, but since the enemies are accused of the crime of treason, they fully deserve the bullet. Then, what are they waiting for? Even if one proceeds from the principle that «first the enemies must be unmasked», nearly a year has gone by since they were unmasked.

But let us take the question of the unmasking. Is this being done correctly, and who is leading it? It is a fact that the party is not doing this, it is not working as an organized force within certain limits, it is paralysed, if not destroyed. The «Red Guard» is carrying out this exposure through dazibaos. The «Red Guard» and all «those who are making the revolution» say whatever they

want, abuse and discredit whoever they want. In a word, it is not the party as a party which is leading all these activities, but Mao is leading them with a series of comrades whom it is difficult to control all over that great China, where, effectively, there is no party, and where the enemy has been working intensively for tens of years. **The existing anarchy cannot be combated with anarchy.**

I think that the great mistake of Mao and the other comrades lies in the fact that they are not handling the «question of the party», the question of the line and the cadres of the party correctly. In my opinion, the question should be presented in this way: Has the party made mistakes during seventeen years or has it not?

Naturally, the Communist Party of China has made serious mistakes. Somebody led it on to a wrong road, and the party was not able to see where they were leading it. Hence, together with a few individuals, many others have made mistakes, too. It is essential that the party analyse its incorrect line and correct it first of all. If the party does not see its mistake, the mistake cannot be corrected. Questions are not put forward in this way in China, and the party is treated in an off-hand manner.

The problem arises: Who is right and who is wrong? «Have Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping made mistakes», and Mao not? Of course, some people there have been wrong, and these are the gang of Liu Shao-chi. However, together with Liu and Teng Hsiao-ping, **the whole party has gone wrong, hence even Mao himself, who has allowed the party to go wrong.** In that case, the party has to analyse and assess this whole situation, and take the necessary measures. In fact, the party has been pushed aside, and others — the youth, the «red guards», have been allowed to criticize the party from outside, not the party directly, but people, everywhere without discrimination. Individuals ought to be criticized, even with dazibaos; but is

there, or is there not a party which leads, sanctions, says: «This is good, or this is bad»? Such a thing has not been seen for a whole year.

Who is left in the Communist Party of China who has not made mistakes? Apparently, Mao with two or three others. Then how will this work be done, with all this mass of misled cadres who have made mistakes, perhaps unwittingly, for years on end? Will they rely on these, separate the wheat from the chaff, and build the party to work normally, in a revolutionary way? This is not yet clear, since the final liquidation of the traitor group of Liu and Teng is still not coming to an end.

It seems to me that many cadres have been exposed and rehabilitated in an incorrect way. The party did not meet to make an analysis of the work and judge the cadres one by one, to face them with their responsibility, to mention their names in dazibaos when the occasion warranted. Chen Yi, for example, is subject to grave accusations in dazibaos. But he is defended by Mao and leads the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is not serious work, nor is it on the organizational road of the party, but there are millions of cadres in this position.

These things can hardly be put in order with an article about «The Treatment of Cadres», or «Down with Anarchy!», because these voices do not catch the ear of the party as a party, as an organized detachment of the class. The party is in confusion, they are keeping it in confusion, and justify this by saying, «the revolution is being carried out». Without the party there is no genuine revolution, without the party the revolution will be lame, will run into serious, unexpected difficulties.

Why don't they begin with the strengthening of the party at the base, if it is difficult to achieve this at the centre? Why are they trying to put things in order from above only? It is clear that the comrades are not relying

on the party as an organized or a re-organized party after the shake-up. They are only appointing committees, like that of Peking (which changed three times, and despite this they hailed it as an event of major international significance).

We cannot understand these methods of action. The wound is open, the slough is being cleaned out. This we see, but it is being cleaned out slowly, not radically, and not as it ought to be, with Marxist-Leninist surgical methods. We shall see, the experience will teach us many things. We only hope that the revolution which Mao is leading will triumph, because this victory has colossal world importance.

As I see it (and maybe I am wrong, because we are still in the dark about many internal facts of their party), the Chinese comrades **have a pronounced dose of liberalism and opportunism in their activities. Naturally, this is very harmful.** These tendencies cannot be either new or accidental. The fact that for seventeen years two lines have been observed in their party and have co-existed without a great deal of friction between them (recently, it has been alleged that there was friction, although they seem so adjusted to each other, that they appear to be a single whole), proves the social-democratic opportunism in their line.

You cannot excuse a mistake or, to put it better, fail to apply a Marxist-Leninist line in the correct manner, by invoking the specific conditions of China. **It is essential that Marxism-Leninism is applied in an undogmatic way in China and everywhere else. The laws of the revolution, of the class struggle, of the nature and role of the Marxist-Leninist party cannot be manipulated as you wish, under the pretext of an allegedly «flexible policy», or of the need for «fair compromises» dictated by the circumstances. If principles are not adhered to, the alliance**

and compromises take a wrong course, and endanger the line, the party, and the proper progress of the revolution.

The fact is that the Communist Party of China has gone on for tens of years on end tolerating two lines in its ranks. **If it proceeds from the principle that two active lines are necessary in the party, then the party cannot be a Marxist-Leninist party.** Even within the party a class struggle must be waged, indeed a stern struggle, to totally liquidate the anti-party, anti-Marxist faction as quickly as possible. We have not seen such a struggle in the Communist Party of China, even when some leaders (who have not been alone) have been condemned as factionists. On the contrary, they have remained not only in the party, but even in the main leadership.

Even now, in the face of this grave situation, with the revolution being waged to seize power from the hands of the revisionists, we see that same sort of dilettantism, soft-heartedness, slowness to act and liberalism towards anti-party elements opposed to the working class. We see that the iron discipline, which ought to exist in the party and in the revolution, is lacking; we do not see its democratic centralism as clear as it should be, especially in revolutionary times, we do not see the true authority of a leader, which is essential, or even the authority of a whole collective leadership in the centre and in the provinces, which is indispensable at any time, and especially at the time when the revolution is being waged.

It is a mistake of catastrophic proportions to leave the party in the dark and to oppose the masses to it, to put the leadership of the party, the true collective leadership, under the uncontrolled, undirected, fire of the broad masses, or the «red guards», who are inspired in a spontaneous and irregular manner. Such laxity cannot be justified with the slogan of the «policy of the masses». The party, organized on correct organizational principles, with

a clear political and ideological line, with Marxist-Leninist centralism and iron discipline, must guide the policy of the masses. **We have had the idea, because this was the impression given, that all these correct norms and principles existed in the Communist Party of China.**

Of course, the group of Liu Shao-chi had distorted the principles and norms of the party, or had put them in the service of a hostile, anti-Marxist and anti-class aim. But to fail to wage a stem, persistent and continuous struggle within the party, and not only in the leadership, in order to elaborate and apply the line from class positions, from Marxist-Leninist positions, from party positions, is a colossal mistake. Nothing can excuse this. This proves that the line has not been clear to all.

It is a great mistake to continue not to tell the party where it has gone wrong. It is told simply that all the mistakes have been made by the group of Liu and Teng. This is one aspect, but the whole party has worked on this line and has been wrong. To try to make the party conscious of its mistakes through the mistakes and betrayal of Liu and Teng, in the way that this has been done from outside, with isolated, disorganized dazibaos, is not in order, is not fruitful, will not temper the party properly in the course of recognizing and correcting its mistakes, and will have further bitter consequences when the party is re-organized.

As to how the party will be re-organized, this, too is not clear. It is clear that revolutionary committees are being formed. I think that these, although late, will continue to lead the revolution and, in some way, to revive the party purged of the revisionist filth, in order to go on to the congress at which the correct line will be defined and the mistakes proved will be criticized openly, finally and correctly. We shall see!

Apart from a series of non-Marxist stands, such as the raising of the cult of Mao to the national and international level, **the Chinese propaganda is acting in the same way with the Proletarian Cultural Revolution, calling it «as great as, if not greater than, the work of Marx and the October Revolution», etc. This is baseless and vain boasting.** According to the Chinese propaganda, all of us have to go through this phase of theirs, because their Cultural Revolution is universal! This is not so, and cannot be so. If a Marxist-Leninist party, which has taken power and is building socialism falls into such a deep sleep that the new revisionist bourgeoisie and the suppressed capitalist classes have almost recaptured power, as is the case in China at present, then power must be retaken, the revolution must be carried out again and it can be called proletarian only if the objectives which it sets and attains and the way it is carried out are consistently on the basis of Marxism-Leninism.

A Marxist-Leninist party like ours, which is building socialism correctly, which wages the class struggle effectively and not just with words, which is deepening the proletarian revolution with success, cannot proceed on the road the Chinese advocate. The road of our party is revolutionary, consistent and Marxist-Leninist. A Marxist-Leninist party like ours builds socialism, deepens the revolution, but does not carry out revolution like that which is going on in China today, because our party has not allowed and does not allow anyone to take power from it, but holds it firmly in its steel grip and there will never be any danger of accidents if it always proceeds resolutely and vigilantly, as it is proceeding, on the Marxist-Leninist road.

WEDNESDAY
MAY 3, 1967

CAN THIS BE CALLED A CADRES POLICY?

It is difficult to understand what criteria are being applied in China on the question of cadres, which is so very important. There is real anarchy, liberalism, and sectarianism, but there are also correct slogans, which are proclaimed in the press.

For years on end we have seen that nothing was altered in this direction in China, everything was considered «normal». Of course, there was a cadres policy, and this appeared to be carried out within the Marxist-Leninist norms. But when serious problems arose, like those of the anti-party groups of Kao Gang, Peng Teh-huai or Wang Ming, the impression was given, of course a false impression, that these deviators were isolated individuals, without a base in the party, and it was considered that their activity was without consequences. This was a false situation, and they made every effort to present such a situation as genuine, indeed they went so far that the party and world communist opinion did not learn why Kao Gang committed suicide, why Peng Teh-huai was again a member of the Presidium, and Wang Ming a member of the Central Committee, to whom a fat salary was paid even while he was a political exile in Moscow. Hence, a liberal bourgeois opportunist stand was maintained towards these anti-party enemy elements. **Khrushchev lauded this stand of theirs, and in a talk with us, Mikoyan described**

it as a «fine stand of the Chinese comrades», that «had nothing in common with Stalin's policy towards cadres».

Perhaps the Chinese comrades will use the excuse that allegedly they could not do otherwise, that allegedly there were two lines, that allegedly Comrade Mao was in the minority, and it was the group of Liu that made the cadres policy. These arguments can hardly be accepted, especially when we have to do with top cadres who are anti-party, whose hostile work has been exposed and who have been denounced by Mao himself.

However, for the moment let us accept the above reason, but why are they acting in the same way now with Liu, Teng, Tao Chu, etc.? Complete silence is being maintained about them, for one year their names have not been mentioned officially, while the walls of China have been covered with dazibaos which leave nothing unsaid about them. And not only about them, but also about all the cadres, including Chu Teh, Chen Yi, Ho Lung, and hundreds of others, whom the dazibaos are publicly tearing to shreds.

Why is this? I think, because among the Chinese comrades the idea exists: «First we must unmask them before the masses, and then officially», or they should exert pressure on them to admit their mistakes, allegedly to bring them into line, to rehabilitate them, and in the end to say: «We did not speak officially, the masses spoke, the masses made criticism», etc. **Thus, sooner or later, we are back where we were — Liu remains president, remains in the Central Committee, remains in the Presidium as Wang Ming, Peng Teh-huai and others did earlier.**

Can this be called a cadres policy?! Can this be called class struggle?! Is this tempering the party?!

What is occurring with Chu Teh? The dazibaos have left nothing unsaid against him. Kang Sheng himself spoke of him as a «corrupt, anti-Maoist militarist», while at the

May Day celebrations in Peking he appeared in public in a demonstrative way together with Mao, fourth in line after him. What are we to understand from this? He has allegedly acknowledged his mistakes and hung on to his position!

Tomorrow this may occur with Liu and Teng, too. Why not? «Let them remain in the posts they have and correct their mistakes», as they told us about Wang Ming and Peng Teh-huai.

Such actions are not correct at all, they will cost China and its Communist Party dear. On this line, Liu and his group will undoubtedly «pull in their heads», as they have done at other times, and will raise them again, as they have done at other times, too. But when they raise them again, Mao will no longer be there to save the situation.

MONDAY
MAY 22, 1967

NOTES ON THE CULTURAL REVOLUTION IN CHINA. THE PARTY IS NOT PURGED FROM OUTSIDE, BUT FROM WITHIN

We can draw the conclusion that Mao's comrades seem to have been in the minority in the party and did not raise the issues to solve them internally, because they would not have overcome the revisionists, with Liu and Teng at the head. Hence the party as a party was neglected.

The debate, the Cultural Revolution, began outside the party. The revisionist group, based on the majority of apparatuses of the party and the state, opposed the Cultural Revolution.

With the raising of the *hongweibings** to revolution and relying on the army, which remained loyal to the line of Mao, successes were achieved in the exposure of Liu, Teng and company, but not yet in routing the revisionist opposition which changed its tactics of struggle, too. Through its reactionary organizations, the opposition, allegedly under the banner of Mao Tsetung thought, incited economism, confusion, anarchy, hooliganism and even open revolt and armed clashes among the ranks of the «red guards», which led to casualties.

At first, Mao did not involve the army in the struggle

* Red Guards.

— this he did later, apparently because he did not consider the situation serious. However, Mao based himself on the army, the «red guards», and the «revolutionary rebels».

It was necessary to go over from propaganda of exposure to the capture of the power usurped by the revisionists. This was the main objective of the Cultural Revolution. For this the army had to be brought in, because it was seen that otherwise nothing would be achieved. The opponent had power, organization, discipline, etc.

At this stage, **the «three-in-one» alliance: the army, the rebels, and the cadres, was proclaimed.** The revolutionary committees were elected on this basis, and the experience of the «Shanghai Commune» was abandoned. Apparently, the form of the three will also be provisional, until the situation is stabilized and power is firmly seized everywhere, because in many provinces it has not been taken, and even where it has been taken the debates and battles continue. The revisionists are resisting and trying to strangle the revolution with various tactics. They are trying to infiltrate the «three-in-one» alliance, to create confusion and to continue the debates for centuries within it, if this line is pursued. They are resisting from outside and creating many new factions from within.

The comrades headed by Mao are demanding that anarchy must be combated and discipline and order established. At present this is found only in the army, but even the army is told «to learn from the masses». The masses are bemused and their only discipline is their «trust in Mao Tsetung». This is positive, but the organized force, the party, does not exist. On this question, the army does not have that experience which the party has.

I think that neglect of the party, failure to carry out the struggle and debates in its ranks, simultaneously with the launching of the Cultural Revolution, **is a major mistake of principle which will cause great harm and worries.** In

the first place and above all, the revisionist faction in the party had to be fought and defeated. This great, indispensable and difficult work should have been assisted by raising the masses into revolution, and the working class, in alliance with the peasantry and the army, should have been at the head of these masses.

In order to triumph, the revolution needs the party of the proletariat at the head, needs iron discipline, clarity of line, and great determination in action.

The Chinese comrades talk a great deal about the class struggle in the party, but in fact they are not purging the party, which is the fortress of the revolution, from within, but are encircling it from outside with people who are not organized in a party of the vanguard. Perhaps the Chinese comrades are acting to create a new party out of the revolution, but we can see no clear signs of this organization. Are they experimenting, are they gaining experience? However, the working class and the peasantry do not appear anywhere in this experiment. The revisionists are using some of them against the revolution, because they themselves claim to be fighting in the name of the party.

TUESDAY
JULY 4, 1967

OF WHAT DOES THE OFFICIAL PRESS OF THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA ACCUSE LIU SHAO-CHI?

The Cultural Revolution which is going on in China makes clear to us many problems which we did not know of, or on which we were not completely clear. The main thing it makes clear to us is that in the ranks of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, and naturally in the party itself, there were two opposing lines: the line of Mao Tsetung and the line of Liu Shao-chi.

We can reach the approximate conclusion that the crisis in the party existed before liberation, continued after liberation, and then flared up in 1959 when the «Great Leap Forward» began and two opposing lines became obvious. As it now appears, about 1962 Mao began his offensive, while in 1965 and 1966 the open struggle began, which was waged with the Cultural Revolution, the «Red Guard», etc. In 1967 (January 21) «Renmin Ribao» writes: «The Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution has been a struggle for power right from the start...».

The accusations against Liu Shao-chi are formulated by «Hong qi»:

— Before 1950, that is, seventeen years ago, Liu followed a line which aimed at the restoration of capitalism.

— In 1940, during the War against Japan, Liu Shao-chi

had a line of capitulation towards the occupiers and a vacillating line towards the Kuomintang.

— In 1945-1946, after the victory over Japan, Liu followed a capitulationist line of peace and democracy. In 1949, he was for delaying the establishment of «people's democracy» in China, and his line was soft and friendly towards the capitalists and their defenders. Liu Shao-chi had reactionary views on culture, and was for not aggravating matters with the Americans.

— From 1953 to 1955, Liu hindered collectivization in the countryside, while in 1956 he came out against the development of the class struggle.

— From 1959 to 1962, Liu Shao-chi fiercely attacked «the Great Leap Forward, the people's communes, and the general line». At this time, he was for an opportunist revisionist internal and external line, for good relations with the Khrushchevites and for softening towards the Americans. At the same time, Liu Shao-chi republished his revisionist book, «How to Be a Good Communist», which contains the theory on the party as he conceives it.

— In 1963, Liu sabotaged the socialist education, and at the start of the Cultural Revolution came out in open struggle to suppress it, the working commissions, etc.

— Liu Shao-chi took part in the «Peking conspiracy», etc.

FRIDAY
JULY 14, 1967

THE FOREIGN POLICY OF CHINA — A POLICY OF SELF-ISOLATION

Since the beginning of the Cultural Revolution, if not earlier, the Chinese comrades **have been developing an ill-defined foreign policy, or to put it better, their foreign policy leans mostly towards self-isolation.** This is not an active and mobile policy. They are shutting themselves away, and with this stand they give the impression that they are infatuated with this policy. In fact, we may say regretfully that their policy is not making itself felt in the way it should and as much as it should, in the international arena. It is not a policy which, based on a correct political line, on the aims and the resolute struggle against American imperialism and Soviet revisionism, follows up and exploits the contradictions in the international arena, works out correct tactics of struggle and aid, according to the changing circumstances, the time and countries.

Their general tactic is: «Struggle with all, hostility with all». Such a tactic is extremely sectarian and leads only to the course, «either with me or against me»; «if you do not think and act as I say or as I act, then you are against me».

If such views predominate in the foreign policy of a state, and especially a socialist state, this is the result of an unsound analysis of the development of events and

phenomena in the international arena, of the lack of an objective analysis. In this situation, it is absolutely essential that all the capacities and possibilities of a powerful socialist state be utilized.

The Chinese comrades are also maintaining an inactive stand towards the international communist movement in general, and the new revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties and groups in particular.

Besides other things, a certain lack of modesty can also be seen on the part of the Chinese, who in a forced manner, sometimes with infantile methods and forms, want to assume the role of the leadership of the international communist movement, instead of leaving it to the others to make such an evaluation. **They present matters in a distorted way: «He who is with the ideas of Mao Tsetung is a Marxist-Leninist; he who allows himself to ask certain natural, fair questions is suspect and can even be considered an anti-Marxist».**

These stands have their source in the exaggerated «cult of the individual» that some dazibaos, which we, of course, believe are uncontrolled (but for the time being these are the official reference materials we have), **put Mao even above Marx, Lenin and Stalin. These posters say: «Mao Tsetung thought is the culmination of Marxism».**

I believe that Mao himself cannot agree with such exaggerations, but the fact is they are occurring. However, to pose these problems in this way is not right at all. **Respect for the merits of anyone can hardly be imposed by force. Work imposes it, life imposes it, the deeds and the correctness of thoughts and actions impose it.**

We have respect for Mao, but being Marxists, we cannot fail to think that if all his revolutionary work is analysed, unclear points will certainly emerge, and there are things which need to be analysed and explained.

For example, the question is raised: What has Mao been doing during these eighteen years and why has he allowed the party to be weakened? Why has he left it in the hands of revisionists, who have eroded it from within? During this whole «dark» period, has Comrade Mao been isolated, has he been in the minority, or has he, too, been swimming in opportunist waters, and as such, permitted two lines in the Communist Party of China?

This whole situation, all this development, is being kept in the dark, being hidden. The newspapers and dazibaos carry only quotations from the works of Mao prior to 1942! But why only before this date and not after it, precisely at the time when these things occurred? And not to mention the mistakes which are occurring now, during the Cultural Revolution.

Despite all these wrong stands, the Chinese comrades want to impose Mao by force as the «greatest Marxist in the whole history of communism», want the whole communist movement of the world to adopt and apply their experience *en bloc***, to apply their Cultural Revolution. The way the Chinese propaganda is presenting the problem is neither realistic, correct, nor acceptable.**

We ask the question: What experience ought we to adopt *en bloc*? There is good experience, and there is no doubt that we should all profit from one another. **When one talks about experience** *en bloc***, especially in these moments, it is necessary to explain what experience is meant. Party experience? About this, and this is the main experience, the Chinese comrades cannot speak, because the revisionist enemy undermined and destroyed their party. They have not yet organized the party.**

Or are they referring to the experience of the Cultural Revolution? This revolution, which is still developing has its good aspects and aims, but also has its bad ones,

such as anarchy, lack of discipline, lack of unity, etc., which go as far as armed clashes.

Certainly, before they make claims about the experience of the Cultural Revolution, the Chinese comrades must first make the theoretical and practical deductions about the role of pupils and students in this revolution, who form the «Red Guard» and are not led by the party. The deplorable excesses, for example, the indiscriminate discrediting of cadres and the great confusion in the party and the state; the state of insecurity, etc., have to be explained. **In these situations, the Chinese comrades recommend: «Carry out the cultural revolution as in our country»! This recommendation is illogical and senseless.**

Being guided precisely by such hasty judgements, incorrect principles, and ill-considered claims, the Chinese comrades could also damage the international communist movement, and especially the new Marxist-Leninist groups and parties which are just being created.

The Chinese comrades have adopted as a permanent principle: «Aid to all Marxist-Leninist groups which are against revisionism and imperialism», but if these movements and groups are not followed in their revolutionary dialectical development, and if they are not assessed from a rigorous Marxist-Leninist viewpoint, the aid could sometimes go in wrong directions.

In seeking to establish that «Mao is the world leader *sine qua non*», etc., etc., at the level of international communism, it could happen that, if some Marxist-Leninist group or party does not put as much emphasis as required on Mao, while deviators in their ranks put this stress strongly on Mao, the Cultural Revolution, etc., in order to hide themselves, and benefit from the aid, then it is natural that the latter will be preferred by the Chinese comrades. And even if, in the end, the hostile work of these factionists is understood, the damage has been done.

The established parties cannot and must not continue to assist particular factions in the new groups and parties under the pretext that they «do not recognize» the latter.

From what we know and what we see, factions have long been reigning in the Communist Party of China, and what factions!! Today they are carrying on there without an organized party. In these conditions, it is natural that the Chinese comrades are unable to give the Marxist-Leninists of the world proper advice on how to form and consolidate their new parties. They think that these new parties do not have an authority at the head of them as great as Mao is for the Communist Party of China. For the Chinese comrades, the «authorities» are on the side of the revisionists, **therefore they tell the Marxist-Leninists: «Have Mao as your leader and carry out the cultural revolution». But without the party, neither the proletarian revolution nor the cultural revolution can be carried out.**

The Chinese comrades think that aid for the international communist movement and the world revolution consists of recommending that they carry out the great proletarian cultural revolution as China did. According to them, from now on, it is not necessary to be inspired by the Great October Socialist Revolution (perhaps by the Paris Commune, yes), but by the Cultural Revolution, because, just as Marxism-Leninism has been replaced with «Mao Tsetung thought», so the Cultural Revolution contains the October Socialist Revolution! The Chinese newspapers are writing these things! This is a disgraceful anti-Marxist stand. How does Comrade Mao allow such things to be written? I trust he has no knowledge of these absurdities, because otherwise the outlook is grim.

Not only is the necessary aid not being given to revolutionary movements (and the necessary aid does not consist only of material aid), but the Chinese comrades, when

they speak about every such movement in the world, do not fail to say, «it is the ideas of Mao Tsetung which created and guide it».

Look at what they say: «In a district of Japan, a hundred communists revolted under the banner of Mao Tsetung». «The Communist Party of Burma is fighting inspired by the ideas of Mao Tsetung», regardless of the fact that it is an old party with experience in struggle. «A faction of the faction of the Indian Communist Party, guided by the ideas of Mao Tsetung, is fighting together with the peasantry for land in the Punjab», and so on. The only thing they have not said directly (although they are trying to say it indirectly) is that the ideas of Mao guide also the Party of Labour of Albania, the struggle in Vietnam, etc. **They go so far in their mistakes and claims that they say: «It is Mao who has created the people's wars, he is the father of people's wars».** In other words, the peoples who have fought for freedom against oppression and so on for centuries, have done nothing. Consequently, the Bolshevik Party and the Party of Labour of Albania, which have waged people's war, have done nothing. For these to be people's wars, they must bear the brand of Mao and his ideas!

Thus, the great classics are written off and the theory about the revolution and people's war is written off. This behaviour is not only unacceptable, but also intolerable.

The Chinese revolution, the liberation war, the Cultural Revolution have big pluses, but also big minuses. We must benefit from the revolutions, because the experience from them is colossal. What is correct should be utilized in the concrete conditions and the specific situations of each country. But the mistakes are mistakes and must be pointed out, so that not only they are not repeated, but they must also be corrected.

The Chinese comrades, directly or indirectly, demand

that everyone should proceed according to their experience. In words they say: «We learn a great deal from the Party of Labour of Albania», but they have never sent a party delegation to our country to see our experience, let alone to gain from it. Naturally, this is their business, but it does not correspond to what they say. Why this occurs only they know. To say whether they discount this experience because their conditions are different, or act in this way from conceit, is difficult for us to define at the present juncture. They may do as they please, while, as for us, we have sent party delegations to China for experience.

The Chinese comrades have arrived at the opinion that the little red book, «Quotations from Mao Tse-tung», is the «culmination of Marxist-Leninist science and philosophy, the key to revolutions and victories». And they say: «Take it, read it, learn it by heart, and come out in the streets and make revolution». Without decrying the value of the overall work of Mao and the correct quotations which have been drawn from his works, we have to say that these claims are infantile.

Communist comrades from abroad come to our country and relate to us that in China they tell them how to organize the front in their countries, how to concoct alliances. However, in these Chinese recommendations we frequently see both sectarian and liberal stands. **We think that, in order to advise other parties correctly, you must be very well acquainted with the political situation in the countries where they operate, and nevertheless you must still be very prudent.** The matter becomes even more dangerous in the case when you have not developed the policy of the front or alliances correctly in your own country and want to serve them up to others as a model.

Concretely I think (perhaps I am wrong) that the Chinese comrades ought to be cautious in this direction.

In India, for example, as far as we know, there are now three «communist parties». Naturally, we support the genuine Marxist-Leninists there, but if you advise them to «carry out the cultural revolution», or issue prescriptions about «how alliances and the front in India should be organized», without first having made an analysis of the front, alliances, and the Cultural Revolution in your own country, probably the Indian comrades will be disorientated.

We think that the Indian Marxist-Leninist comrades ought to rely on the Communist Party of China, ought to seek its aid, and this should be given, **but we also think that it must always be borne in mind that the Indian comrades themselves are responsible for their own affairs and are most competent in these affairs.** Advice can be given to them and to anyone else who wants to listen to it, perhaps they should also be criticized in a comradely way when they make mistakes, or combated when they deviate, but prescriptions should not be given.

If we implement the genuine Marxist-Leninist norms in relations with other parties and groups, everything goes right. **Marxism-Leninism is the most exact, most rational, most mature, and most infallible science if it is applied correctly. But if you do not apply it correctly, then you deviate. No good will come from turning things which are simple or complicated into a few stereotypes, and from seeking to solve them with quotations and ready-made formulas.**

If we observe the official state policy of the Chinese comrades, we shall see that it is not at all balanced, can say that it is non-existent, or when it is expressed, it is wrong.

It seems that in the countries where there are Chinese political and economic emigrants, the Chinese comrades have openly set them in motion in defence of China, pro-

pagating that they should act in violent ways with the authorities of the countries in which they are living. This propaganda is not wise. The authorities of different countries retaliate against the Chinese emigrants for their acts of violence, and this is natural, because the bourgeois and capitalist leaders cannot be tolerant in this direction.

On the other hand, the relations of China with nearly all the capitalist states have been built upon violence and the violation of all diplomatic norms. There is no foreign capitalist embassy in Peking which has not been surrounded and attacked by the «red guards». What is happening in Peking is precisely what occurred in Djakarta when the Indonesian fascists attacked the Chinese Embassy. With these and many other gestures in its relations with other countries of the world, China is creating great rigidity, making it impossible to act either in politics and propaganda, or in reciprocal commercial relations.

The lack of control and the unclarity in the political and cultural slogans, and even worse, when these are distorted and manipulated by the capitalist and revisionist propaganda, isolate China and create a certain coolness among the peoples of the world, because this self-isolation, brought about with such astounding carelessness, does not allow China to display its successes in all fields in the world arena. The Chinese exhibitions have disappeared, they have been replaced with the little red book of Mao's quotations, with a few magazines which are printed in Peking and distributed abroad by passing from hand to hand.

Capitalism and revisionism are bemusing peoples' brains with unrestrained propaganda against China. Apparently the Chinese comrades think, in contrast to what they say, that the «ivory tower» is best. It seems they think that the capitalists and the revisionists are greatly put out when China is not present in the international

arena. This judgement is wrong, because to avoid the presence of China is precisely what the enemies want so they can act freely.

Chinese diplomacy is inactive, not only in relations with the capitalist countries but also with the liberated countries of Africa and Asia. The bourgeois leaders of these countries are benefiting from the passivity of the Chinese diplomacy. They simply take some aid from China (when it provides it), but apart from this, nothing else is heard. And this sluggishness is because of the unwise policy of China.

For Chen Yi it was a great success that «the authorities of the Republic of Mali allowed the distribution of some books with the quotations of Mao»! This is lamentable. The bourgeoisie in France is printing these quotations itself and selling them freely on the market. As everyone knows, the French bourgeoisie has tight control over the authorities of Mali, who know very well how to keep China far away from their people.

This whole mistake lies in the fact that, although they say that their links with the peoples must be strengthened, they have not found the way to achieve this aim. These links cannot be achieved in subversive ways and without finding the splits between the capitalist leaders of these countries themselves. These splits must be exploited.

The Chinese comrades have great faith in spontaneity, they take their time and say: «There is time, seeing our example, the peoples will follow us». They are wrong when they think that their example is all that is needed for the victory of the peoples, especially when this example is not very clear.

The communist comrades throughout the world are not finding the necessary aid in the Chinese policy and diplomacy. Let us take the Arab-Israeli con-

flict. What is China doing in the diplomatic field in these delicate moments? Nothing organized.

When Nasser asked for aid, China gave it to him immediately. There is no doubt that it did well, but Nasser only thanked it for its aid and thought: «That is all I need China for». We think that possibilities ought to have been found to publicize the assistance and support for the Arab people. But what are these possibilities? In this direction one of them is the utilization of the ties of friendship which exist between the Albanian people and the Arab peoples. But does it cross the minds of the Chinese to utilize the links with and the trust the Arabs have in the Albanian people and the principled policy of socialist Albania for the deepening of the friendship and collaboration of our countries, China and Albania, with these peoples? Not in the least! We propose it to them, they do not reply.

China, a great socialist country, cannot be permitted to pursue such a policy without perspective, full of apathy, and extremely sectarian. It is the duty of China to play a main and decisive role in the international arena, where resolute stands against the enemies must be maintained, while taking advantage of their contradictions, which must be worked on to make them deeper, because they assist our struggle.

China speaks about strategy and tactics, but we do not see any tactic in the Chinese diplomacy. It is conducting an opportunist policy with the local bourgeoisie (the principles of the 8th Congress of the Communist Party of China about coexistence with the national bourgeoisie remain in force, the local capitalists still receive rent from their factories which have been nationalized), other organized parties are permitted in the front there, at a time when the Communist Party is in confusion and disarray!

Despite the respect we have for the Chinese comrades, such things cannot be left uncriticized or uncorrected, especially at a time when they are doing everything in their power to impose themselves as the leadership of international communism. **If such a glorious role might pertain to China, this cannot be achieved with a line containing mistakes and without collaboration and consultation with the Marxist-Leninist parties. In relations between Marxist-Leninist parties there must be unity and equality and not such considerations as: «big and small parties», «mother and daughter parties». We must not eat our words. Our Party has never done this and never will do it in regard to anybody. Our guide is the Marxist-Leninist theory. For our Party there are four classics of Marxism-Leninism: Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. All others are their pupils.**

MONDAY
JULY 24, 1967

THE CHINESE DIPLOMACY HAS FALLEN ASLEEP

1 — This is the most favourable moment ever for action on a broad scale in the Arab countries on the part of China, or another such moment will not occur for a long time to come. It seems to me that the Chinese diplomacy has fallen into a deep sleep and is dreaming unrealizable dreams.

Following the Israeli attack of June, the Arab countries and their leaders now find themselves in a difficult situation. They are bemused, because from one side the Soviet revisionists, Tito, the Czechs, etc., are acting in their direction, while the Americans, the French and the British are acting from the other side. The leaders of the Arab countries are trying to find support amongst these enemies, because, according to them, there is nothing else they can do.

The revisionists and the imperialists, in alliance, have their claws at the throat of the Arab countries, while China is allowing them to act freely, thinking that the supplying of a quantity of wheat and a ten million dollar credit, which it provided for Nasser, is sufficient.

What the Arab countries need, first of all, is the great political weight of China. We are convinced that they want such support even if only so they can exert pressure on the iron grip at their throat. Hence the political intervention of China in the Arab countries in these mo-

merits would be of colossal assistance to these countries.

The peoples of these countries will welcome Chou En-lai's going amongst them at these moments with enthusiasm. A true friend is recognized in difficult times, and political action cannot be valued in dollars. If China comes out in this way, it will be a major bombshell to the revisionists and the Americans. The imperialist-revisionist world will be alarmed, while the friends will rejoice. And China's foreign policy itself has great need for such an action.

The Soviet revisionists are manoeuvring undisturbed in the Arab countries. The American imperialists, too, are going about their own work. And so are those other powers which have predatory interests in these countries. What is China doing? China is carrying out the Cultural Revolution!

However, if you are going to the Arab countries to make propaganda about the Cultural Revolution, to exalt the cult of Mao and to do the ground-work to sell his photographs and the red book of quotations there, when the ground is slipping from under the Arabs' feet, you had better stay where you are, because you'll make matters worse.

I think it will be a political triumph for China and for all of us, if a government delegation of the PR of China, headed by Chou En-lai, goes to the Arab countries.

2 **— What do the Chinese comrades think about the question of Cuba? Is it not the time that, while safeguarding our principles, they moved a little from their rigid positions towards it at these moments** when Castro has contradictions with the Soviets, with the capitalists of the Latin-American countries, and with the United States of America, as always? We know Castro for what he is, what ideas he has, what aspirations he nurtures, and what methods he employs. But the fact is that with the country

in a very difficult economic situation, in his own way he is resisting both the Soviets and the Americans to some extent, and issuing calls for «world revolution». Castro does not accept our views and neither do we ever accept his views. But, while his views do not influence us, our views might influence him.

The fact is that he is showing signs of approaches to us, and feeling the need for us. Then, should we continue to remain «rigid» and refrain from carrying out a principled policy to deepen the differences between Castro and the Soviets? Certainly not. We ought to make a move. What do the Chinese intend to do in these situations so that we can co-ordinate our actions?

In all the anarchist activity of Castro, there are certain stages which must not be forgotten, such as the resolute resistance to the Americans, the resistance over the question of the missiles, the fight at the Bay of Pigs, and now the disagreements with the Soviets. Castro is not a purist but neither is he like some Korean or Rumanian leaders. Castro has a pronounced sense of resistance. Relying on these features, without retreating from our principles, we should try to influence him for the better, because this is in the interest of the revolution.

(I spoke about these matters with Comrade Nesti Nase for him to bear in mind in his conversation with the Chinese ambassador, in the form of a free talk, and in the form of suggestions.)

SATURDAY
JULY 29, 1967

CHINA AND INTERNATIONAL EVENTS

China has shut itself away. Even its closest friends, as we are, are not hearing anything of what is going on within China, how things are going there, how the Cultural Revolution is developing, are they seizing power and consolidating it, are they proceeding with the organization of the party, or not? How is the economy developing? Or what about the agriculture? Nothing, absolutely nothing is being let out.

For a long time our embassy in Peking has been completely without work, without meetings. Even at any chance meeting with some functionary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, this person says nothing to our comrades, either because he does not know anything, or because he is afraid to speak, or because the Chinese lives by the general slogan of isolation. Meanwhile the Embassy of the PR of China in Tirana is completely non-existent. It has been without an ambassador for a year, and all the others who are there are «dead» silent, they simply go for walks, make visits, say nice words about our country, but as to their own country, what is going on there, not one word, absolutely nothing.

The Chinese press and Hsinhua news agency are also saying nothing about the events in their country, but are juggling with quotations and the same themes which they have dealt with over and over again for two years. But even these are written with such «perfection»

that you can get nothing out of them, can learn nothing about what is being thought and done. Those who write these «pot-boilers» have become masters at saying nothing by repeating the same thing all the time.

But is it correct to adopt such a line on such important internal questions of China? No, this is a wrong line. World opinion wants to know what is going on in China, how the Cultural Revolution is developing there, and what its successes are. China has millions of friends throughout the world, they have hopes in it, and therefore they seek its aid. Progressive opinion, which is waiting impatiently, sympathetically, is becoming fed up with stale phrases and with commentaries on quotations, and this opinion is being told nothing concrete, but is being left to the bourgeois press and radio to brainwash it with every kind of slander, intrigue, fabrication, etc. Thus, in the absence of the reality (which China itself ought to make clear), the fabrications of enemies become implanted and confusion, coolness and distrust concerning what China is doing, are created. The very line which China has adopted says to the world: «Don't concern yourselves so much about us», or «praise us», «praise Mao, but it doesn't matter if you don't know what is being done here». This means to scorn external opinion about internal matters.

Meanwhile, China has completely relinquished involvement in external affairs. It is not involved at all in international problems, its voice is not heard on any question, because it has chosen the road of silence. Is this a Marxist-Leninist stand? No. Can this be excused by saying, «We are occupied with the Cultural Revolution»? No. Can they say, «We have neither the cadres, nor the technical and financial possibilities to do this»? No, not by any means.

There is no real excuse for this major mistake being made by the Chinese comrades who are using the tactic of silence and an alleged disdain of international problems.

This stand is condemnable, unacceptable, and non-Marxist. Objectively, this stand assists imperialism and modern revisionism. In fact, it is a quelling of the political struggle, quelling of the stern polemic, quelling of the exposure of the fiendish deeds of the enemies of the peoples and communism. And the enemies like it if you don't speak, if you don't criticize, if you don't disturb the waters, if you don't ruin their plans, and leave them free to work in peace. No, this is not right.

It is not right, also, because the friends and comrades who love China and Mao and have respect for them, at the same time want to see their stands at these very important moments through which the world is passing. It greatly pleases the Chinese if you follow them, but follow them in what? In their silence? Should we fold our arms and wait open-mouthed till it pleases the Chinese to engage in international problems? Those who think and act in this way are fools and not Marxist-Leninist revolutionaries.

This stand gives people reason to create illusions. The foreign minister of Czechoslovakia said: «Why does Albania attack us, while China on the contrary has done nothing against us?». And carrying on from this, the stand of the Czech revisionists towards China has become friendly; the police have been removed from the Embassy of the PR of China in Prague, the slogans have been cleaned off, and the personnel of that Embassy can go about freely there with «friendly» greetings and respect.

Why is all this? Why this graveyard silence on the part of the Chinese? What is going on in Czechoslovakia? Can this stand be justified with the excuse that «the Czechoslovak revisionists are against the Soviet revisionists»? Should it be forgotten that they are revisionists, reactionaries, friends of Bonn and the Americans? Hence the two sides, both the Czech revisionists and the Soviet revisionists, are enemies and must be fought.

Perhaps the Chinese, with their «strategic eye», are seeking to remove the danger of a third world war from Asia to Europe, to remove the threat from their borders, and through their silence «to allow» the contradictions to develop in Europe. However such a thing must not be pursued passively. **It is in our interest to destroy modern revisionism, first of all in the Soviet Union, to destroy the Soviet-American alliance, and to destroy American imperialism.**

But the struggle against them must be waged on a world scale, must be very active, and not passive, left to spontaneity. We must deepen the contradictions between the capitalists and revisionists, but the Chinese tactic of silence is not correct. Here there is something big which is not in order. Seen from the Marxist-Leninist angle, it turns out that China has toned down the strong, principled, basic struggle against the Soviet revisionists, while against the others it is not saying a word.

The fight against Indian, Japanese, or Indonesian reaction has died down completely. Even against the United States of America the fight is waged only just enough to avoid saying it is not waged at all.

Can this whole situation be ignored under the pretext that they are occupied with the Cultural Revolution? Can this whole situation be explained by saying, «We have no reliable people»? It is hard to accept such a thing. The Cultural Revolution might go on for years, but will it continue like this, with this lack of interest in the major world problems, in which China ought to play a major and decisive role for the benefit of the proletarian revolution?

If we go a little more deeply into this matter we shall see that, under similar pretexts, the Chinese comrades are not assisting and not encouraging the new revolutionary movements and the new Marxist-Leninist parties. Perhaps they give them some small material aid, but this is

not the only aid which they ought to give them. In particular they want the great political aid of China, while China is not speaking about them at all, except for a few new parties in Asia, like that of Ceylon and that of Australia.

We base these assessments on the facts which we have. Time will clear things up for us.

TUESDAY
AUGUST 15, 1967

IT IS GOOD THAT THEY ARE DOTTING THE I's

The recent «Renmin Ribao» article, «Are We to Follow the Socialist Road or the Capitalist Road?», reveals that in the Communist Party of China there have been two lines, one bourgeois capitalist, and the other revolutionary. The former was led by Liu Shao-chi, and the other by Mao Tsetung. With a series of quotations, the article brings out the great treachery of Liu Shao-chi and a large group which followed him. It also brings out how Mao opposed this line.

According to the facts presented, Liu Shao-chi, Teng Hsiao-ping and company have truly betrayed Marxism-Leninism, therefore they should be struck lethal blows. This should have been done long ago. **The questions always arise: Why was this hostile work which, according to the documents presented, had been detected long ago by Mao Tsetung, allowed to develop? Why was it allowed to become so threatening that «it endangered the existence of socialism and the dictatorship of the proletariat in China»? For the present, these questions are not being answered.**

However, such a situation has caused colossal damage to China and the Communist Party of China, millions of cadres have been misled, thinking that «the line that was followed by the enemy was the correct line of Mao». In brief, anti-socialism, anti-Marxism has been allowed to conceal itself under the name of Mao. On the one hand,

Mao was bombarded with praise, and on the other hand, intensive enemy work was carried out. **This means to have completely lost one's revolutionary vigilance, or to content oneself with repeating a few correct principles over and over again, and allow the enemies to manipulate them as they please and to do the opposite, or to partly reconcile oneself to this unhealthy situation, or be completely in the minority, because the enemy has managed to deceive the majority.**

The exposures of enemy groups within the Communist Party of China have been passed over almost in silence. This matter has not been stressed to the necessary extent and in the proper way, and indeed many of those enemies continued to occupy positions in the central leadership.

Why did this occur? For the moment, this question is not being answered. Why were these scores of rabid enemies, like Liu, Teng, Peng, etc., etc., who were recognized as such as early as 1921, able to capture the keys of the party and the state? This is not being answered, either.

The Chinese comrades have kept us in the dark in connection with this hostile work of such major proportions. They may say that we should have understood it ourselves. But how could we understand it when Liu Shao-chi was the second person in the party, when he was even made President of the Republic, when his word was listened to all over China, and they respected him everywhere? How could we suspect these people when Mao Tsetung himself described them as «worth their weight in gold»? How could we suspect them when they were «condemned» for opposing the line and nevertheless remain members of the Central Committee and the Political Bureau? Even now, a year after the revolution broke out, the name of Liu Shao-chi is covered up, he is still not being named. The laws for the protection of capitalists, over which Liu and company are accused, are still in force in China. These

are not revolutionary actions at a time when you claim to have raised the people in revolution to save the revolution.

We understand that it is difficult to speak of and analyse many things in these difficult situations, when the struggle is going on to recapture state power and to overcome the «revisionist monsters». But it seems to us that this question has two aspects: external and internal. The external aspect can wait, but the internal aspect needs to be cleared up, because there are millions of misled cadres who have made mistakes, while thinking they were on the right road, and are now condemned. But the Chinese comrades should have greater respect for the external aspect, too. **They should take a firm revolutionary hold on the press which is dropping unimaginable bombshells.**

The Chinese press is bombarding Mao with paeans of praise, making a real god of him, liquidating Marx, Engels, Lenin, and Stalin, as if there were nothing wrong with this, and reaches the scandalous point of saying, «Those who do not follow the road of Mao and the Cultural Revolution, whether revolutionary Marxists of the world, or countries where the dictatorship of the proletariat is in power, are deviators». This is not Marxist, this is Trotskyism, this is wrong.

As far as we are concerned, we have respect for any good, correct idea of Mao's, but our only correct unerring course is, and will remain, Marxism-Leninism.

1968

TUESDAY
JANUARY 16, 1968

CHINA IS SILENT AGAIN. THE PERIOD OF ISOLATION HAS RECOMMENCED

We have almost no contact with the Chinese comrades and do not know officially what is occurring there since the visit of our delegation. The period of isolation has recommenced. They withdrew their ambassador in Tirana, because he turned out to be implicated in the activities of the Liu-Teng group. When will another come to replace him? There is no sign — perhaps after a year, or even two. However, in reality it is all the same, with or without an ambassador, because even when the Chinese Embassy in Tirana has its titular head, no one hears him, no one meets him, and he does not seek to hold any conversation with us. He is more like a master of ceremonies. He merely gives the usual dinner to celebrate the National Day and accompanies some Chinese cultural delegation when it makes a visit here. Even when we happen to meet, he does not express himself openly, but merely repeats a few stereotyped formulas and quotations without daring to analyse any of them. In a word, the titular head of the Chinese Embassy in our country does not show any sign of courage, or personality.

How is the Cultural Revolution developing, what is occurring and what is being done internally, what does China think about world problems? We know nothing for sure. Even our ambassador in Peking has no official contact to receive information on these problems. He is left

with only what he can learn from some dazibao, or some newspaper of the «Red Guard», full of rumours and contradictory stands — saying one thing today and something else tomorrow.

This is occurring at a time when we ought to be kept up to date on many things, because we wish China well, are closely linked with it, and think we should assist each other with experience on the road of Marxism-Leninism.

How is the struggle for the seizure of power going on, how is the revolutionary unity being created, what is its aim, and what results have been achieved; what is being done on the reformation of the party and mass organizations; what cadres' policy are they carrying out now; what roles are the army, the «Red Guard», the working class, and the peasantry playing at these moments; how is production developing; how is the class struggle being waged, are there armed clashes, is reaction organized, is it being assisted by the Soviet revisionists, American and world imperialism, etc., etc., and if so, how? A thousand questions, one as important as the other. We can get no accurate, that is, official information about any of these things.

Should we follow what the Hsinhua says? It is difficult to understand anything from the Hsinhua, because Mao himself told our comrades that it was half under the control of the «enemies». Now it is said to be run by the army, but this is producing propaganda full of appeals, phrases, allegories, «poems», a noise from which you can never get to the essence of the problems I listed above.

There is nothing for it but **to try and draw our own conclusions, and, as up till now, we shall build up our own propaganda in defence of China** and the correct objectives of the Cultural Revolution. It is self-evident that this does not exclude suppositions and inaccuracies either; it is different when you are kept up to date on the problems.

THURSDAY
JANUARY 18, 1968

THIS TIME THE CHINESE «CAME TO LIGHT»

After great efforts on our part, the Chinese have given us a positive answer on the question of the Vau i Dejës hydro-power station. They finally agreed to advance the construction by one year. They tell us that all the materials will be sent. May it be so! This time the Chinese «came to light».

FRIDAY
JANUARY 19, 1968

GOOD NEWS FROM CHINA: THE PARTY IS BEING REORGANIZED

Good news from China. The main newspapers are writing about and publishing the directive on the reorganization of the Communist Party of China and the mass organizations. This made me very happy, because **without a strong, organized party, with sound democratic centralism, nothing can be achieved nothing can be successful.** Thus it is confirmed that up till now the Communist Party of China has been suspended or broken up and that the Cultural Revolution was led by Mao and «the Main Group of the Cultural Revolution». But such a situation must not be prolonged, indeed, whatever the needs of the existing situation, the whole period without the party in the leadership has had many negative consequences and will have them in the future. Nevertheless, this is a positive result for the Cultural Revolution because it has struck a heavy blow at the revisionist danger, if it has not liquidated it altogether. **Certainly, a greater struggle inside and outside the party, iron discipline, extreme revolutionary vigilance will still be necessary in order to completely liquidate the foundations and roots of revisionism in China.**

Without doubt, the reorganization of the party has decisive importance, but the problem is how this reorganization will be done, on what bases and principles. It is known that the only correct principles which can save the situa-

tion are the Marxist-Leninist principles. Will Mao and company continue any longer to permit «trials» and «experiments» in order to «first see what experience shows», etc.?

The Chinese comrades are capable of doing such things and they themselves saw what harvest they reaped. Therefore, if they do not issue clear-cut Marxist-Leninist directives, there is the danger that the confusion on this capital problem will still continue. The Chinese comrades are not without experience for the formation of a genuine communist party. They have their own experience, and also have the great experience of the Bolshevik Party of Lenin and Stalin, regardless of the fact that they do not mention this experience. I think and am convinced that if the Chinese comrades do not make the Leninist experience of the bolsheviks on the party of the proletariat the basis of the reorganization of their party, they will not bring to light anything healthy and their party will suffer even more severely than it suffered before. Of course it is their right to learn from their own experience, but they should see this experience as it is and understand that what occurred was a great lesson for them and for all Marxists. From this viewpoint the Chinese Cultural Revolution was something new (because it regained power from the hands of the revisionists) and the reorganization of the party is another new thing (because we hope that a Marxist-Leninist party can be reorganized from a party Which was riddled with revisionism). Hence, both the Cultural Revolution and the reorganization of the Communist Party of China are two aspects of the same problem, full of positive and negative lessons and experience. We rejoice at the carrying of the victories through to the end, the achievement of revolutionary objectives, therefore we welcome these things whole-heartedly.

SATURDAY
JANUARY 20, 1968

WE SHALL NOT RESPOND TO THE CHINESE SILENCE WITH SILENCE

I gave the orientations and theses **for the publication in «Zëri i popullit» of an article on «the importance of Mao's instructions on the reorganization of the Communist Party of China and the mass organizations»**, in which the three phases are to be dealt with:

1) The phase of the Cultural Revolution;

2) The phase of the reorganization of the party;

3) The phase of the reorganization of new structures, and the stabilization and normalization of the whole situation.

In fact, we do not have accurate official data about the development of events in China, but **we cannot and must not respond to the silence of the Chinese with silence.** We shall base ourselves on the things we know and make analyses and draw the proper conclusions from the viewpoint of our ideology.

MONDAY
JANUARY 22, 1968

DEFEATS AND VICTORIES OF THE CHINESE REVISIONISTS

It is becoming clearer every day that the Chinese modern revisionists, headed by Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping, «had vested themselves with power and taken the capitalist road», as the Chinese comrades put it. This means that **this hostile, reactionary, rightist faction, which existed for tens of years at the head of the Communist Party of China, worked and organized the great plot to transform China into a capitalist country**, the dictatorship of the proletariat into the dictatorship of the bourgeoisie, and the Communist Party of China into a bourgeois revisionist party.

The Chinese revisionists had advanced a long way in these directions. How they prepared this terrain, how they created the forms of work which they used, how they exploited the mistakes observed, the major concessions in line, the lack of vigilance on the part of the Marxist-Leninists and other acute problems, I shall not deal with here also because many things are still unknown to us and are internal questions of the Communist Party of China. However, the fact is that **in the line of the Communist Party of China, apart from other publicly known concessions, their 8th Congress, held in 1956, marks a date and a further stage in the consolidation of the revisionist positions.** The achievement of this success by the Chinese

revisionists proves that resistance to them in the leadership and in the whole Communist Party of China was weak, was put up by the minority, and was not as active as it should have been.

The situation in the Soviet Union, following the death of Stalin and the seizure of power by the Khrushchevites, assisted the Chinese revisionists and encouraged them to strengthen their positions in the party and the state and to prepare to usurp power completely. However, the struggle which began against modern revisionism hindered them from acting and carrying out their diabolical plan at their ease. Mao and the Chinese Marxist-Leninists woke up, so to say, gathered strength and began to react. The struggle against the Khrushchevites and modern revisionism brought about the beginning of clashes within the CP of China. The Chinese revisionists tried in a thousand ways to extinguish or restrain the polemic against modern revisionism. At first, in order to protect their compromised positions, they began with demagogy, while not openly impeding the struggle of Mao's side against the Khrushchevites. It is clear that up till these moments the Chinese revisionists had occupied the key positions in the party, the state, the administration and in other sectors. They had their cadres, right up to the Chief of the General Staff of the Army, ready for action everywhere. The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the militia were in their hands. They had undermined the party and put it to sleep. It carried out the line dictated by the revisionists, and called it «the line of Mao Tsetung». But the storm was building up and the fact is that, despite their strong positions and the great encouragement of Khrushchev, the Chinese revisionists proved to be weaker and less courageous than Khrushchev and the Khrushchevites in the seizure of power. Apparently they thought they had to play for time.

The Chinese revisionists calculated wrongly. They must have thought that Mao, who had no real power either in the party or in the state, but only in the army, was incapable of recapturing the positions which they had managed to take. They must have thought, also, that Mao would not throw the army into struggle against the party, the state and those masses which may have been deceived. Therefore, they temporized and this led to their defeat. The Chinese revisionists underestimated the great authority of Mao among the people and the party and did no foresee the counter-blow which they would receive.

Mao, knowing the weak positions he had in the party, and in the state administration, having a reliable reserve in the army, and relying on his authority and on the great love the masses nurtured for him and for socialism and communism, raised the masses of the youth in the Cultural Revolution, which was called cultural, although, in fact, it was a political and ideological revolution for the liquidation of the revisionist group of Liu Shao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping. Millions of youths rose in the revolution, which was a strategic and tactical act of Mao's. The Chinese revisionists did not foresee this action. It was like a powerful political strike, under the regime of the dictatorship of the proletariat, which had as its primary protagonists the youth, and not the working class.

As it seems, Mao thought that if he raised the workers in revolution, even armed clashes might occur between the workers and the «Red Guard», which would require the intervention of the army of the working class and its dictatorship, and this would «hurt both the innocent and the guilty».

Perhaps these were the reasons that the various orders which Mao gave the army were that it should not open fire, should avoid the provocations which might be, and in fact, were made against it, and should display its powerful

presence at the decisive moments. And the army showed its presence when it was necessary to liquidate the disturbances of the «red guards», or to intervene and take over the key positions itself, wherever the revisionists resisted. Such activity of the army implied to the working class that the army belonged to it, to the working class, to the dictatorship of the class, under the leadership of Mao, and defended the dictatorship and the socialist state. These stands helped the working class and the peasantry to be ready, vigilant, and to avoid the confusion, chaos and any other form of revisionist sabotage. They also assisted to make the workers and peasants politically clear so that they, too, could carry out the Cultural Revolution in the factories, in the work centres, and in the cooperatives, but not with the forms of the «red guards», among whom the question of demonstrations was the most important aspect, although necessary, because of the role with which they had been charged in the Cultural Revolution.

According to Mao, the «Red Guard» was to carry out the political and ideological exposure of revisionists and traitors. This exposure would serve the peasantry, too. This counter-blow took the Chinese revisionists by surprise. They thought that their opponents would either capitulate or use the classical form of revolution for the seizure of power, and that they would crush any form of resistance that might be used against them through the usual legal forms of the party, which they had under their control. But when Mao launched the Cultural Revolution they were stunned and unable to find other forms to stop the rise of this great tide, apart from the famous «working groups of the Central Committee», which came to a bad end from the first days. The Chinese revisionists suffered blows from the «red guards'» storm, because the apparatus of the party or state, in which they had strong positions, and from which they could have acted, was paralysed. Mao accepted the exces-

ses which the «red guards» might commit as a lesser evil than the confusion, disorder and general anarchy, which the Chinese revisionists were to use as the only means of their counterrevolutionary struggle. And it turned out that even before the defeat of their action by means of the «working groups», the Chinese revisionists began to consider other forms of counterrevolutionary struggle, in conformity with the existing situation. Prominent among these forms were the encouragement of factions in the «Red Guard», the clashes, the compromising of cadres who had made some mistakes, the excesses, the extremist acts, the frequently useless movements of the «red guards», the open resistance of the revisionist cadres, the incitement of workers against the «Red Guard» and against the revolutionary cadres, the capture of radio stations, the workers' strikes, economism, the distribution of weapons, and, in the end, even the armed attacks. The more they were exposed and lost ground, the more the Chinese revisionists strove, are striving and will strive, to fight and carry out sabotage by adapting themselves to the situations and forms of work which the revolution, led by Mao, creates or consolidates.

Nevertheless, the main danger has been eliminated. As the Chinese declare, the revolution has entered the phase of its consolidation, the phase of taking power. Naturally, this phase is not ended in all the provinces, because, **the recapture of power, that is, the purging of the revisionist elements in the state and its apparatuses, will be a protracted, continuous process.** Now the Chinese comrades are working for and have proclaimed the reorganization of the party and the mass organizations. Naturally, this has special importance.

The reorganization of the party is the decisive issue and the victory or defeat of China depend on this. The question is: On what foundations will the party be built? Will the basic Marxist-Leninist principles on the building

of a truly Marxist-Leninist party be kept in mind, as they should? If so, first of all, there must be no forgetting or distorting of the principles of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin on the party. **I have hopes that the Communist Party of China will purge itself of alien petty-bourgeois and bourgeois world outlooks, of everything bad, sectarian, opportunist, and revisionist in its organization, ideology, policy, strategy and tactics.**

The Communist Party of China is faced with colossal basic work, because it has suffered greatly from leftist and, especially, rightist factions, and may suffer from them again, if a profound Marxist-Leninist analysis is not made of all the situations through which the party and the country have passed, if the mistakes are not criticized with bolshevik courage and a new, correct, unwavering line is not defined. This requires a great change in its organization, policy, and a correct, profound ideological understanding of problems, epochs, events, situations, groups, and of the individual people who have acted during all these periods and have been active in the events. **The reorganization of the party means that the best, most revolutionary people, those who have given proofs in struggle and difficulties should remain in the party, and likewise new people should come in, the best ones, who have been tested for their loyalty to Marxism-Leninism, the people and the party.** I think that, first, it is essential to reorganize the nucleus of the party, which should be very carefully selected, absolutely loyal, because the great and glorious burden will fall on this bolshevik nucleus to sort out, with a Marxist-Leninist eye, all the other cadres who constitute the majority, and to distinguish, check up on, and verify which cadres are worthy of remaining in the party and which not. In the first place, I think that the finger should be put on the best ones, who must go into the leadership, into the committees and the key positions. If this is not done in a

scientific and revolutionary manner, it will be hard to establish the norms which are vital to the life of the party.

A Chinese bolshevik party, rebuilt on the basis of Marxist-Leninist criteria, will be the salvation of China and the guarantee that it will proceed on the Marxist-Leninist socialist road in the future. The burden of putting everything in order falls on such a party. Its first duty is to summon the 9th Congress, which, being held in a Marxist-Leninist spirit, will be an historic congress for China. This party has the major task of reorganizing the state, of purging it, of establishing new, revolutionary, proletarian norms everywhere, by taking new, severe, sound administrative and organizational measures and re-examining and revolutionizing whole sections of the superstructure, which have been deeply infected by anti-Marxist, revisionist ideas, and so on. During all these processes of capital importance, naturally, the enemies are not going to remain idle. Since it is impossible for them to stop the process of the reorganization of the party and the state, they will try to hinder it. Later they will try to infiltrate the party and the organs of state power again and, under disguise, will struggle to hinder, to slow down and sabotage the revolutionization of China from within. But **if the enemy is underestimated, as has occurred up to now, then China is lost. You can talk as much as you like about the class struggle, but this struggle must be waged sternly, correctly, from the positions of the working class and Marxism-Leninism.** China, recovering from a grave illness, has great need of this class struggle which must never be carried out with campaigns, with stale slogans and shibboleths, divided into points and according to individual whims, but must be waged continuously, sternly, and with Marxist-Leninist consistency.

What we call the cult of Mao, which is truly an inflated cult, is assuming ever more unprecedented pro-

portions. But why does Mao permit the inflation of this cult? Perhaps the critical moments which China went through, the fact that the Communist Party of China was not only in confusion, but also in the hands of revisionists, impelled Mao to permit the inflation of his name and authority in order to mobilize the sound revolutionary energies of the masses so that he could hurl them into revolution. Otherwise, China would have been lost. I do not know to what extent this great boosting of the cult of Mao can be justified, but in any case it seems to me that this inflaed cult of his has nothing Marxist about it.

The period of the vigorous political exposure of Liu Shao-chi, who has been called the «Khrushchev of China», and his group, seems to have ended. Naturally, the struggle will go on, along with the complete seizure of power through the revolutionary unity, the sorting out of cadres through the Cultural Revolution, the taking of decisive steps for the reorganization of the Communist Party of China, the Communist Youth, the organization of women and the trade unions of China. If these decisive sectors are strengthend in a Marxist-Leninist way and remain up to their tasks, if the dictatorship of the proletariat is truly established in China, then genuine victory will be achieved and consolidated.

In following the development of the Chinese Cultural Revolution from outside, without sufficient facts about the real situation in the Communist Party of China and China itself, the possibility cannot be excluded that we will formulate hasty conclusions, based on the daily facts and on what is given by the Chinese radio and press, which, themselves, were under the deep influence of revisionist elements and did not present the situation objectively. Therefore, it was and still is difficult for us, from outside, to avoid being wrong in some assessments a priori, when in China itself there are mistakes and uncertainties, when

forms and tactics are changed one after the other, when idols and cults are overthrown and new ones created. We see and feel that many of the forms and methods which have been and are being used in the Cultural Revolution are not in the least Marxist and revolutionary, but, regardless of the mistakes or concessions which have been made during the carrying out of the revolution, we hope that revisionism will be routed in China and that the party there will carry the work it has started through to the end, without again permitting those distortions, mistakes and confusion, which have been observed up till now and which led China to the brink of disaster.

WEDNESDAY
MARCH 20, 1968

THE VOICE OF CHINA IS NOT BEING HEARD IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA

From what we can see, in the international political arena the voice of China is almost, if not completely, paralysed.

The Cultural Revolution cannot be presented as the cause of such a thing, in my opinion. The Cultural Revolution is, first of all, a political and ideological revolution, and its objectives and actions should not be concentrated within China alone, to the neglect of the struggle in the international arena. No pretext is valid to cover up this absence which is very much felt. It will be even worse if the problems of international policy are underrated and arrogantly disdained while justifying this stand from the standpoint: **even if I do not intervene, even if I do not have my say, the world needs me. Even if I do not speak and act, the world is afraid of me. Nothing can be done without me.**

This negligence could also be excused in this way: We are still not in the position; the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is still unorganized, it is being purged, and is taking part in the Cultural Revolution. This could be an excuse, but to fail to find and appoint good people of which you have plenty, so that they can take the guidance of these problems in hand, means to fail to make good the great losses in the international arena where the

imperialists and the modern revisionists are hatching up major intrigues, are organizing traps and forging chains for the communists and the peoples. This stand, which is being maintained today, will cost dear tomorrow.

In practice, the voice of China is not being heard; thus it is not acting wisely. From time to time China speaks about Vietnam, which it considers a major question (this is correct), and the only one which merits its attention (this is not correct).

The propaganda against Soviet revisionism, also, is not active, but naive, one-sided and, in particular, restricted to exposure of its treacherous line towards the war in Vietnam, to its links with Miyamoto, and some other things of this nature. It is self-evident that this is a lame attempt at struggle in face of the Soviet revisionists' actions in the international arena and in the international communist movement. In order to fight and expose them, they must be pursued, step by step in every action. But that is not all. In order to achieve this objective, their plans must be foreseen and smashed to smithereens, not contenting ourselves with an occasional article but through energetic actions of every kind. China is doing nothing in these directions.

Many important events and phenomena are occurring in the world; the capitalist crisis is developing at a furious pace, the cliques are splitting, being overthrown, uniting, the structures and superstructures are changing, the contradictions between revisionist states are increasing, etc., etc., and the Chinese colossus, which can and must play a decisive role at these moments, is sitting almost silent. «Let everything take its own spontaneous course!» This thesis is not correct. This is a great failing.

The peoples, mankind, the communists, are waiting to learn what China says on this or that problem. But China is saying nothing, **either because it has no head, no**

time, or does not deign to! This situation cannot be accepted and must be changed as quickly as possible.

But to whom can we express these opinions, with whom should we discuss them? For nearly a year they have not had an ambassador even here in our country. Can this lack of ambassador here be covered by the excuse, «we haven't a good man»? Or is it because of their silent dissatisfaction that we are not following their mistaken tactic of silence, and not shouting hosannas to Mao? No, we do not accept such things. This stagnation of the Chinese policy in the world arena is very dangerous for the struggle against imperialism and modern revisionism.

We see a similar superficial stand of the Chinese comrades towards the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups. In fact they have contacts with and give assistance to these parties and groups, even to those groups which remain separate from or against the new parties! They justify these undifferentiated contacts with the position they have adopted from the beginning, saying, «we shall assist all the groups that fight imperialism and modern revisionism». But the struggle brings about differentiations, and these should be followed up attentively, on bases of principle.

In fact, the Chinese comrades also make some differentiations, but sometimes they are not effectively in a position to follow the real revolutionary activity of those they recognize, who in some cases hide behind the propagation of the Cultural Revolution, or behind the distribution of Chinese materials and Mao badges.

Some of the new parties are dissatisfied with these stands and have expressed this dissatisfaction, sometimes openly and sometimes in undertones.

The Poles and the comrades of the Communist Party of Italy (Marxist-Leninist) have similar complaints. These questions must be resolved, in my opinion, dispassiona-

tely, realistically, and in a comradely way. Here I am not talking of Grippa, who demonstrated publicly that he was anti-Chinese and openly defended Liu Shao-chi. But, nevertheless, Jacques Grippa found a pretext in the words of a certain Rittenberg who worked at the radio in Peking. From what we gather, he, and his wife along with him. is an American agent and has been arrested in China. But, be that as it may, in taking up what Rittenberg said, Grippa revealed his anti-Marxist countenance.

THURSDAY
MARCH 28, 1968

THE CHINESE «ARE VERY BUSY WITH THE REVOLUTION», THEREFORE THEY ARE UNABLE TO MEET THE COMRADES OF THE MARXIST-LENINIST PARTIES

They told me that the Polish comrade Michal has received word from Peking that «the comrades are unable to receive him at present, because they are very busy with the revolution». He was annoyed at this «excuse» and expressed this to the Chinese chargé d'affaires in Albania. «It is two years since our party was formed,» he told him, «and China has not said one word about it», etc. We have a right to ask: What aid will be given to the new parties if they are not recognized and not publicized?! Astonishing!

THURSDAY
APRIL 25, 1968

THE CHINESE COMRADES CONTINUE TO SHUT THEMSELVES UP IN THEIR OWN SHELL

Under the cloak of the Cultural Revolution the Chinese have shut themselves up completely in their own shell. **They want to give this revolution the look of a «world revolution», but in practice they are doing nothing to ensure that it can at least be given the name of a «world» revolution.** They are simply publishing the quotations of Mao in millions of copies and in many languages, making millions and billions of Mao badges and spreading slogans in praise of him. Nothing else, absolutely nothing else.

All the contacts of China with the external world have been completely frozen, if not broken off altogether. All the Chinese ambassadors have been withdrawn from the countries where they were serving. Neither their papers, nor Hsinhua, nor Radio Peking deal with any international problem. Even many internal problems are scarcely dealt with at all. What is being done internally? How are things going? We know nothing.

Even with us, their closest friends, all contacts are glacial. They don't allow our ambassador in Peking any meeting, he is isolated. An astonishing situation!

They do not accept to send a delegation for the May Day celebrations as usual, allegedly because they are occupied with the Cultural Revolution! «Please understand us,

Albanian comrades!», they say, but we do not understand their attitude at all. If the People's Republic of China goes on like this, then the outlook is gloomy! They have not invited any delegation from our side either. A proletarian state! The celebration of proletarians! It carries out the Proletarian Cultural Revolution! indeed «the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution», and does not celebrate it, does not invite anyone because it is occupied with this «revolution». This, too, is astonishing! Then why declare that you have taken power everywhere and the internal situation «is excellent»? Let it be so! This is what we ardently want, but to us, as Marxists, the situation is not clear.

SUNDAY
JUNE 2, 1968

ADVANCED CHINESE POSITION ON THE WAR IN VIETNAM

A correct position against the Americans and exposing for the Soviet revisionists. In an article in «Renmin Ribao», the Chinese tell the Americans: «...you should not be surprised and set up a howl because North Vietnam helps its brothers of the South. Nor should you be surprised and set up a howl that the Chinese help their Vietnamese brothers. Even that formal boundary that was, no longer exists, you violated the 17th parallel and are fighting all the Vietnamese. You have come from across the ocean and are fighting Us, while we Chinese, don't we have the right to defend our brothers, our countries, our freedom and independence? We, the Chinese and the Vietnamese, are united, will fight to the end and will smash you». This is briefly the Chinese stand, a stand of grave consequences for the American aggressors and the revisionist traitors.

Now the United States of America has to choose: either to continue the war, to become more deeply involved and end up in its grave, or to get out of Vietnam «with its tail between its legs», like France. The American blackmail does not work any longer. Now the initiative is no longer in the hands of the Americans. They cannot get away with their demagogy, even with their friends. The predatory war remains predatory war, it will turn

into a second Korean War, with the difference that many of the allies that assisted the United States of America in Korea will not be present in Vietnam. The end of the Americans will come more quickly.

Now the Soviet revisionists are in a fix, they are facing sensational exposure. This stand of the Chinese, provided they do not waver, blocks the way to the Soviets' treacherous secret negotiations, destroys their demagogy, unmasks their pose as «saviours» of Vietnam, and makes dust and ashes of their aims of «peace agreements», their real aims of making Vietnam capitulate.

The whole of Vietnam and Indochina must erupt and hurl the Americans into the sea as quickly as possible. This is the only way to salvation, fight to the finish and as fiercely as possible to ensure that the United States of America is no longer permitted to bomb the Democratic Republic of Vietnam without restraint, to ensure that the United States of America is not permitted to strengthen its weak positions in Vietnam, to ensure that the United States of America does not dare to extend local wars elsewhere, and that the United States of America receives a colossal military and political slap in the face as quickly as possible.

TUESDAY
OCTOBER 15, 1968

CHOU EN-LAI'S INCORRECT VIEWS ON REVISIONISM

Even after all this struggle against Titoism and the Khrushchevites, even after the Cultural Revolution, Chou En-lai continues to make mistakes.

The fact that he arrogantly told us to go to Moscow after the fall of Khrushchev, is well known. The question was that we were to reach a reconciliation with the Brezhnev-Kosygin revisionist group, in which the Chinese had great expectations.

Our reply to his proposal, dignified both in its content and tone, is also well known. Chou En-lai went to Moscow without us and there he suffered the ignominious defeat of which I have spoken earlier. **Later we were told: «We made a mistake in going to Moscow and in proposing it to you, too», etc., etc.** However, these were only words, because Chou is repeating the same mistake.

Speaking with Beqir Balluku about the international situation, and especially the situation created in the Balkans after the invasion of Czechoslovakia, Chou En-lai proposed that **we should enter into negotiations with the Titoites and sign a treaty of friendship and mutual aid with them!**

How did these Chinese comrades come to think so wrongly and to follow the course of Liu, who preached that

«in order to fight American imperialism we must unite with the modern revisionists»?!

How did these Chinese comrades come to think that in order to fight the Soviet revisionists we can unite even with Tito, an inveterate open agent of the American imperialists, a rabid enemy of Marxism-Leninism, simply because at a given moment, he has temporary contradictions with his ideological friends, the Soviet revisionists?!

No, Chou En-lai who expresses these opinions is not on a principled course. **The treacherous revisionist line of Liu Shao-chi is being kept alive by Chou En-lai, who has not purged his brain and his heart.** I say he has not purged himself, because Chou En-lai is a clever man, his stand cannot be the reflection of an immature idea, or one he has taken without his having gone into it thoroughly. If the other Chinese comrades have approved this stand, too, they have made a grave mistake.

But why should they come to make such a mistake?

First, there is ideological unclarity among the Chinese comrades. They are not very clear on what modern revisionism, both Titoite and Khrushchevite revisionism, is and where its great danger lies. As to Chou, he is the primary and main one who is unclear on this, because he is acting very wrongly in these matters.

Second, on Tito and Titoism they still have the view that, «Tito was not wrong, but Stalin was wrong about him». And when circumstances bring about that Tito has contradictions with the Soviets, the Chinese comrades soften towards him, their old opinion of Tito and against Stalin predominates and leads them to the wrong opportunist course. (Here the line of Liu Shao-chi of alliance with the revisionists emerges, but this time not against the Americans, because Tito is their agent, but only against the Soviets.)

Third, from these and other facts it turns out that

the Chinese comrades do not base their struggle against the Khrushchevite revisionists fully on Marxist-Leninist principles and do not fight them at any time and in every field, consistently, from this basis, but in their struggle, have certain tendencies to chauvinism, territorial claims against the Soviet Union, and ill-founded judgments about the alleged mistakes of Stalin in the international communist movement. As a result of these mistakes the Chinese comrades do not analyse the problems and events correctly, and do not take correct decisions on a number of capital problems.

Fourth, for the Chinese comrades, whoever appears to be against the Soviets is their possible ally, regardless of who the pseudo-ally, even a temporary one, is. Such a strategic and tactical line, which is not guided by the Marxist-Leninist principles, is to be condemned.

What are they proposing to us in fact? To reconcile ourselves to Titoism, to embrace the most ferocious enemy of Marxism-Leninism, socialism and communism, the most ferocious enemy of our Marxist-Leninist Party and our socialist Homeland; to embrace Tito, to reconcile ourselves to this person who, for twenty-five years on end, has striven with all his might to oppress, destroy, and enslave our Homeland, and make it the 7th republic of Yugoslavia! Hence, Chou En-lai is telling us to betray everything sacred to us, our glorious war, our people and Marxism-Leninism.

To advise a sister party and a fraternal state to enter into such alliance with Titoism, because, at the present juncture, the latter has some disagreements with the Soviets, which might easily be smoothed over tomorrow, or to hope that Titoism might be a «Trojan horse» to help penetrate the «third world», all this is the strategy and tactics of a bourgeois policy.

Of course, socialist Albania can never allow anybody

to think he can use it as a pawn. Albania is sincere, loves its friends and remains loyal to them on the Marxist-Leninist road. However, on this occasion, we must draw certain conclusions of a general strategic character. Naturally, it is also possible that we are wrong in these assessments, because many of them are based on the changing international circumstances.

In the general line of their struggle, the Chinese comrades are fighting on two fronts: against American imperialism and against Soviet revisionism. China might be attacked by the two sides simultaneously, could be attacked by one side first and by the other later, or may not be attacked from either side, because the relations between these two imperialist states, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, are becoming more tense, the contradictions between them are becoming deeper, and the third world war may begin as a war between imperialists. Here we have in mind Stalin's thesis about the character of wars.

Our duty and China's is to prepare ourselves for defence, in case of war, and to expose both the American imperialists and their allies, and the Soviet revisionists and their allies, with all our means.

The aim of our struggle must be to weaken the two imperialist powers, by encouraging the frictions and contradictions between them and within their states, by weakening the links of their allies with them, and by struggling to weaken their influence in the countries and among the peoples which are not linked with military alliances. Either we must raise these countries against the imperialists of the United States of America and the Soviet revisionists so that they become a serious obstacle to their aggressive plans, or at least we must neutralize them. Therefore, along with our preparations for defence, we must develop a very active policy in the international

arena, but a policy based on sound analyses and founded on Marxism-Leninism. There must be neither adventurism nor deep sleep in our policy.

The preparation of China and its policy, naturally, have great importance. Is China employing all its means to fight on two fronts? In principle yes, in practice not as much as it should and how it should. In the strategy of China, the Soviet revisionists are considered the main and most powerful enemies, the enemies which have the greatest possibility to attack it and damage it most. China also considers the Americans savage enemies, but with fewer possibilities than the Soviets to attack and damage it. This is because the Soviets have land borders with China, while the Americans, in the main, must land from the sea. This is not easy. The Chinese say that the First World War, the Second World War, and especially the Americans' war in the Pacific Ocean against the Japanese, proved this. (Both of them, the Americans and the Soviets have atomic bombs.)

However, it must not be forgotten that the United States of America becomes very dangerous if it manages to use militarist Japan as its bayonet, and the other countries of that region, from Indonesia to Australia, etc., as bases, and the peoples there as cannon fodder.

On the other hand, the Soviet revisionists have a number of very weak points if they attack China. Not only must they prepare for a protracted war in Asia, but first of all, public opinion must be prepared for such a war, and this is not so easy.

The other weakness of the Soviet revisionists is Europe. Before they enter into war with China they must secure their flanks. First, they have to keep control of the European revisionists, i.e., their allies of the Warsaw Treaty, who, allegedly to protect the European front, are not going to take an active part in the adventure against

China. However the German-American danger to the Soviets in Europe is great and cannot fail to become threatening to them, if they involve themselves in an adventure against China. The more deeply the Soviets become involved in a war with China, the more they risk everything.

No Soviet-American «alliance» can prevent the realization of the aggressive expansionist aims of the Germans in Europe, and likewise, those of the United States of America at the expense of the Soviet Union and its satellites, which, at the most favourable moment, might abandon it. NATO cannot permit the domination of the world by the Soviet revisionists. Both the Soviet Union and the United States of America aspire to this. Therefore it is impossible that one will work for the other, but each of them will work to tear out the eyes of the other.

Looking at the question from this angle, it turns out that the Soviet Union is not the stronger, but the weaker of the two imperialist powers, with a very long border to defend, with very wavering allies and with an imperialist partner, the United States of America, which aims to seize power and world domination from it. But the partners of the United States of America, also, have major contradictions with it, and these will increase. Both Japan and Federal Germany (not to mention the other members of the NATO group) have their own plans and ambitions and will play their own role both in the preparation of a world conflagration and in their participation for war.

We see already that the Soviet revisionists are consolidating the European front, cordoning off the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Czechoslovakia, Rumania, Bulgaria. The emergence of the Soviet fleet in the Mediterranean is part of the strategic plan in anticipation of the further sharpening of antagonisms with NATO, and in the first place, with the United States of America and

West Germany. With this plan the Soviets are strengthening the military front against Bonn, encircling Turkey and Greece, aiming to attack Albania, and to establish bases in Africa, from which the Anglo-American allies attacked Italy and Nazi Germany during the Second World War, etc.

Can it be said that these activities are in the interest of NATO and the Americans? Can it be said that these activities and their extension are watched with serenity by the United States of America? No, this will deepen the contradictions between these two imperialist groups, and this might even lead to war between them.

Hence we see that preparations are being made in Europe, preparations similar to those which led to upheavals in Czechoslovakia, and tomorrow might lead to similar events in Rumania, the day after tomorrow in our country, where the Soviets aim to have naval bases, to establish themselves properly in the Mediterranean. As compensation for these preparations, the Soviets are trying to save the Americans in Vietnam. Hence we are at the stage of the consolidation of the military positions of the Soviets in Europe, in the Mediterranean and in Africa. How far they will go with this, we don't know. Therefore we must be awake, vigilant, and not only us but the Chinese, too.

However, when we say that the struggle must be waged on two fronts, let us take a glance at how the Chinese comrades are waging this struggle at present. We are not seeing anything done in the direction of Japan, a possible ally of the United States of America against China, in order to expose it or to deepen Japan's contradictions with America. China is a big power. What is it doing with India? Nothing. And Chou En-lai advises us to form an alliance with Tito! We do not see any severe political blow, on a world scale, on the part of China against

the capitalist states, friends of the Americans, from the Indonesians down to the Australians.

We do not see any concrete active policy with the countries of Africa and Asia, «non-aligned» in pacts, where the United States of America and the Soviets make the law. Chou En-lai's hopes to bring these states into the Chinese fold are based on Tito, this agent of the Americans and friend of the Soviet revisionists. Such a policy is not right. **Such a policy of stagnation, without perspective, is extremely dangerous to us.**

The Chinese comrades have not yet organized their press, their Foreign Ministry or their diplomacy. How can they go on in this way, when the enemies are on the move and organizing rapidly for war against us and the peoples?

Hence a major duty devolves upon us to continue the political and ideological struggle on all fronts, even in those directions where China does not wage it. No aspect of the international problem can be ignored on our part. They will call us «megalomaniacs» on many issues, when we speak about India or Japan, but we must proceed from the principle that we must exert our influence, however slight, on certain issues. The Chinese comrades ought to concern themselves with or declare themselves on a series of problems which are vital for the world and socialism. In all due modesty we have to stand in the forefront of the struggle.

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 24, 1968

CHOU EN-LAI'S PROPOSAL OF A YUGOSLAV — ALBANIAN «DEFENSIVE ALLIANCE»

According to reliable facts which we have, it emerges that at a time when the situation between Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union and the situation between the Soviet Union and Albania were becoming acute (September-October 1968), the top Yugoslav leadership discussed the possibility of concluding a Yugoslav-Albanian defensive alliance. It was said that this proposal should come from the Yugoslav side. However, after much discussion and being convinced that it would be rejected by the Albanian side, this matter was left unmentioned.

The astonishing thing is that this idea of the Yugoslavs coincides with the proposal of Chou En-lai. It is certain that the Yugoslavs must at least have suggested it to the Chinese, if they have not discussed it together, in secret.

Even the latter is possible, because the proposal Chou En-lai referred to was accompanied with his opposition to the strategic and tactical principles of our defence. Such a thing became clear to us, because Chou **did not display readiness to supply us with heavy weapons; he suggested to us that at the very first attack of the enemy we should give way to it and take to the mountains to wage partisan war; he suggested to us that we should co-operate with Tito, and finally, in order to intimidate us, he capped it all**

by saying: «Following the presidential elections in the United States of America, by spring or summer of 1969, you may be in danger».

In other words Chou En-lai said to us: **Hurry up, link up with Tito, form a unity and alliance with him, for that is your road to salvation.**

1969

TUESDAY
APRIL 29, 1969

THE CHINESE ARE SILENT ABOUT THE EVENTS IN CZECHOSLOVAKIA AND EUROPE

There is not even a peep out of the Chinese comrades about what is occurring in Czechoslovakia, Poland and Europe. In the newspapers and what they say on their radio, they are not giving the slightest indication of what we are writing and saying against the revisionists. Astounding!!

We are informed from Prague that the strict surveillance by the Czechoslovaks around the Chinese Embassy has been lifted, those who enter the Chinese Embassy are not controlled, the Chinese only listen to what they say and that is all. Astonishing!!

The employees of the Chinese Embassy have told our comrades: **Our stand towards the Czechs depends on their stand towards the Soviets, that is to say, even if the Czechs of Dubcek are fascists, they need only be anti-Soviet, and «they are fine». Astounding!!**

What sort of people are those who work in the Chinese Embassy? Can they be followers of Liu and Teng who shout «Long live Mao»?! Anything is possible. Or can it be that the Czechs, out «of good will», officially inform the Chinese: «The Soviets are doing this and that to us and we are resisting, we have erred towards you, but we cannot say so at the moment, though we want to improve our relations with you», etc., etc.

The Chinese tactic is that, until the «opportune moment», «until the situation is clarified», they are saying nothing. Or they are proceeding from the wrong principle: **«Provided they are anti-Soviet, even if they serve the counter-revolution, this does not affect us much, because they are in Europe», and the fact is that the Chinese policy is not concerned at all about Europe. Astounding!!**

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 9, 1969

THEY INVITE US TO THEIR CELEBRATION BUT THERE IS NOBODY TO RECEIVE US

Comrade Nesti Nase informed us of the invitation which the PR of China extended to us to take part in the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the Republic. They invite us but, at the same time, add, «the comrades in Peking are extremely busy, we are preparing for war», «we are not going to have a big celebration, however, we are inviting you because you are our brothers» etc., etc.

Astounding things! In one word, they want to say: «Send a second-rate delegation». The Chinese ambassador, who has just come to our country and whom we have not yet seen, «will go to Peking to welcome our delegation», because supposedly there is no one to receive it there! Meanwhile, here, in the Embassy of the PR of China, they say that they will give a big reception to which they will invite all our leadership, but the ambassador himself will not be there. For three years their embassy has been without an ambassador. The two who were here before this one, have been arrested, and this one who has just arrived, instead of remaining at his post, «is to go to Peking to welcome our delegation». They are doing many astonishing things!!

We must send a delegation headed by a member of the Political Bureau such as Comrade Haki Toska, for example.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 12, 1969

ANOTHER VACILLATING STAND OF THE CHINESE COMRADES

The Chinese ambassador told Comrade Nesti, «In the address at the celebration in Peking (for the 20th anniversary of the founding of the People's Republic of China), we (the Chinese) are not going to mention the Soviet revisionists, but will say 'social-imperialists', so that they do not walk out of the hall»!!

You do as we do, is what the ambassador wanted to say.

Rita [Marko] informed us from Hanoi, where he has gone to take part in the funeral of Ho Chi Minh, that Li Hsien-nien had said to him: «If Kosygin offers us his hand, we shall shake it, because we have diplomatic relations»!! Rita rejected this idea, and Li Hsien-nien was obliged to leave Kosygin's hand mid-air when he offered it to him. Astounding! Astounding!!

SATURDAY
SEPTEMBER 13, 1969

KOSYGIN IN PEKING

Behind all the «amazing events» of yesterday we can see the ears of the hidden rabbit. Yesterday Kosygin turned back from Irkutsk and went to Peking. There Chou and Li Hsien-nien received him and, as TASS reported in the evening, they discussed «matters useful to both sides». Everything was prepared secretly long ago. Apparently there is no end to their perfidy!

MONDAY
SEPTEMBER 15, 1969

CHOU EN-LAI MET KOSYGIN

We suspected that Chou En-lai might have met Kosygin in Hanoi at Ho Chi Minh's funeral. Chou En-lai is capable of such political pirouettes. This suspicion was well-founded, although a great deal of water has gone under the bridge since the beginning of the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution.

The traitor Soviet revisionists and their Chinese allies, with Liu Shao-chi and company, have been exposed. Despite the victories achieved, a great deal of work is still needed to consolidate these victories, and first of all, to ensure that the Communist Party of China is re-organized and consolidated on the Marxist-Leninist road.

Has this been achieved? Regrettably, we doubt this. We know that the situation has been strengthened, that it is moving towards stability everywhere, but as long as the party has not taken the work and the leadership firmly into its own hands, there is the danger of vacillations in line, and more to the right than to the left. Many may be keeping quiet, may appear «remorseful», «convinced», or «re-educated» until the «severe» storm of the Cultural Revolution passes, and then re-activize themselves, recommence the work in new forms, with new slogans, in «new» situations, under «the banner of Mao Tsetung thought», waving the little red book, wearing on their

chests the red badge with the golden portrait of Mao Tsetung!

One of these may be Chou En-lai. Therefore, we suspected that he might have some meeting in Hanoi with the arch-revisionist Kosygin. When Chou left Hanoi before Kosygin arrived there, we rejoiced and said: «A resolute stand. Now the Chinese do not even want to set eyes on Kosygin», let alone shake hands with him, even formally, or talk to him.

Later Li Hsien-nien went to Hanoi for Ho Chi Minh's funeral. He wanted to «shake hands with Kosygin», but Comrade Rita, you might say, stopped him.

This moment went by, and we thought that the question was closed as it should have been. **But there is more to it than meets the eye. The Chinese and the Soviet had long been working in secret for a meeting between Chou En-lai and Kosygin.**

After Ho Chi Minh's funeral, Rita was invited by Li Hsien-nien and went for a visit to Peking. To Rita, or to us here in Tirana they said nothing. On the day of Chou En-lai's meeting with Kosygin in Peking, the 11th of September 1969, Rita also had a meeting with Kang Sheng and others. Just as they were leaving, Kang Sheng told Rita, «It is possible that Kosygin, on his return from Hanoi, will stop at Peking airport, indeed it is possible that right now, while we are here, Chou En-lai is talking with Kosygin at the airport». Rita said in astonishment: «How is such a thing possible? What will they talk about?!». Kang Sheng replied with the greatest shamelessness: «We know nothing». And after these words, which had deliberately been left to the end of the meeting, they parted.

Not only did they not tell their «closest» friends and comrades anything in connection with this meeting before it took place, but even at the eleventh hour, when the talks

with the revisionist had ended, this was hidden from us, and we were told about it by Chou En-lai two days later in the presence of Kang Sheng. Such a thing proved clearly that negotiations about this meeting at the level of prime ministers had been going on for a long time before, and indeed «conditions» had been laid down on the part of the Chinese. This stand towards us on the part of the Chinese is wrong, insincere, and bad.

From the first radiogram Rita sent us, it turns out that Chou En-lai informed him that, with Kosygin, he had talked about these things:

1 **— The border problems should be settled**, and until they are settled:

a) the status quo should be maintained;

b) the attacks should be stopped;

c) the two sides should withdraw their troops from the disputed zones;

d) the herdsmen from the two countries should be free to move about in summer, as before, to pasture their flocks.

2 **— The problems connected with railways, rivers, seas and airspace should be solved.**

3 **— Certain problems of trade should be solved.**

4 **— Ambassadors should be exchanged.**

The pre-conditions of the Chinese for these talks:

1 **— The ideological polemic is not to be stopped.**

2 **— The Chinese atomic bases must not be attacked by the Soviets because then it would be all-out war.**

According to Rita's radiogram Chou En-lai added: «Kosygin accepted these things in general, and he will present them to the leadership. These talks were held on the instructions of Mao Tsetung and Lin Piao. The Soviets asked for the talks because their internal situation is one of great crisis; Kosygin is the 'dove' who has handed in his resignation on three occasions. Through these talks, they

want to exert pressure on the United States of America and will have a reduction of tension for a time, without knowing how long it will continue, but we (the Chinese) will not make any concessions to the Soviets».

The first and only radiogram we received from Rita states these things briefly. He leaves Shanghai for here on the 16th of September. Rita told them of his «preliminary personal opinion» that they did not do well to meet at this high level, that this was a mistake that favoured the Soviet revisionists, who would make use of it. We shall learn more details when Rita reports to us himself. However, we can judge even from what we know. Since the Chinese comrades do not inform us, we must work things out on the facts which we possess.

The Americans spread a «sensational» report: **the Soviet Union is going to attack China and especially the Chinese atomic bases.** The bourgeois press and chancelleries continue to inflate this report. The bloody Soviet provocations on the Chinese border and the massing of hundreds of thousands of Soviet troops (?!) over the whole length of the Sino-Soviet border, support this report.

Can the Soviet revisionists have taken such a decision?! Anything is possible, but I think that this is a Soviet-American bluff to intimidate China. Simply basing ourselves on the judgement of Chou En-lai himself, we believe that the Soviet Union cannot be prepared to launch war on China when internally the country is in a crisis, when there are divisions in the Soviet leadership, when it «has so many contradictions» with the United States of America that it is seeking «to smooth things over with China» in order «to exert pressure» on the United States; let alone if we make a more thorough analysis of the international situation. In other words, the revisionist Soviet Union is preparing for war, but it is not yet ready to wage it, especially with China, at a time

when the situation in the country, its rear area, its flanks and its contradictions with the United States of America are not in order.

In my opinion, the Chinese were terrified and wavered in the face of this colossal blackmail frame-up. Unsound analysis of the international situation and unrealistic interpretation of the facts which they possess have brought them to this. The facts they have cannot be reliable, but they interpret them as «reliable».

The Chinese comrades have been intimidated because they have overestimated the power of the Soviet revisionists and American imperialism.

They (and this the Chinese comrades know) are still not sure of themselves internally in regard to the consolidation of the party and the state. This is precisely what has frightened them, and now they are trying to play for time.

The revival of the opportunist-liberal-revisionist line which, it seems, the Cultural Revolution is still far from having combated properly and eliminated, makes the Chinese comrades vacillate.

Chou En-lai has always been for deals and compromises from rightist positions. He tells us, «Mao and Lin Piao had instructed» him to hold these talks with Kosygin. This may be true, but I think he himself is the main inspirer.

To accept a reduction of tension on the basis of blackmail serves the enemy. You can say, «I warned the adventurers, who had plans to attack our atomic bases, that, if they did such a thing they would have war to the end. And they retreated. We assisted the 'dove' Kosygin, who is not in favour of adventures», etc., etc.

First, such a thing could have been achieved without Chou En-lai's meeting with the revisionist Kosygin, and would have had even greater effect, because it would have eliminated the supposition of «fear» and implied, «I

did not fall for this concocted bluff», because it was based on the reports spread by the Americans.

Second, why should this «dove» Kosygin, a revisionist czar like all the others, be helped?! Why should the balance of forces in the Soviet leadership be helped? Why should the «softening of things with China» serve the Soviet revisionists as capital, either at home or abroad?! Why should the «softening and lowering of tension» with the Soviet Union and the czars of the Kremlin, with the renegades and gangsters, as they have been called, and as they are in reality, hold up the consolidation of the victories of the Cultural Revolution?!

Precisely in these things lies the great mistake of the Chinese comrades in such an act of responsibilities and consequences. We agree that it was necessary to talk over the questions of borders etc., but not at the rank of Chou En-lai. These talks could have been held at a very much lower rank, and allowed to go on for years on end, if need be. The Chinese themselves say, «We are not afraid of time, time is working for us». Then why all the haste?

For three whole years Chinese diplomacy has been sound asleep. Now it has just woken up and the first sensational thing it did was to give its hand to the Russian czar, Kosygin. However you turn and twist this, Comrade Chou En-lai, you will never convince us. We know the difference between chalk and cheese.

We shall continue to maintain correct, principled, friendly, fraternal and benevolent stands towards the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China and towards Comrade Mao Tsetung. Our criticism will always be principled and based on facts. We love and respect the Chinese comrades, we shall continue to tell them openly of our opinions, as we have done. We should discuss and explain our opinions as comrades. **But we shall not impose on them any opinion of ours which**

they may consider wrong, and neither should they have any illusion that they can impose any of their mistaken opinions on us.

We shall follow vigilantly the further results of this «new line of reducing tension with the Soviets, without making any concession to them» such as Chou En-lai has advocated. **We do not budge a fraction in regard to our stand towards modern revisionism, led by the Soviet revisionists, and imperialism, led by the imperialism of the United States of America.**

THURSDAY
SEPTEMBER 18, 1969

THE ECHO OF THE CHOU EN-LAI — KOSYGIN MEETING

Only a few days have passed since this meeting, which, naturally, has caused great surprise, because in the state which the relations between China and the Soviet Union have reached such a top-level meeting was not expected. Hence the meeting created a sensation, and as such, it is more in favour of the charlatans than of the Chinese.

The Chinese may claim, «We gained prestige, because it was Kosygin who came to Peking and we did not go to Moscow». This is a «Pyrrhic» victory, because just the propaganda advantages, which the Soviets and their friends gain, outweigh this so-called Chinese prestige. To compromise others, the Soviets are ready to go to the devil himself, or wherever they can make even a small gain. In this case their gain is great, whether the meeting leads to no more than this or even if it falls through. The Soviets will blame the Chinese for this, saying: «We made the effort and sent our prime minister in person to Peking. On the Chinese part there is lack of good will, if no more than that».

The Chinese may claim that «the meeting had results and the adventurers of the Kremlin retreated from an attack on China, because a prior condition for the meeting was that the Chinese atomic bases must not be attacked,

because then China would go to war with the Soviet Union».

The fascists violate treaties, let alone words. Either the Soviets were going to attack or they were bluffing. It depends on how one judges the real situation. **We think that today, in this existing situation, in the circumstances, the Soviets are bluffing.** Apparently, the Chinese assess the situation differently from us. But if the Soviets have decided to attack China, they will attack tomorrow, if the Chinese are not conceding much to them. If they were bluffing, regardless of what the Chinese said, the Soviets understood clearly that the Chinese took the blackmail seriously, were frightened, came to the talks, and the ice was broken.

As to what extent the ice was broken we shall see as things develop, but after the first astonishment, world opinion began comments. Naturally, Marxist-Leninists do not like this meeting and do not find it correct or opportune. **The revisionists are jumping with joy because «the talks with China have begun, and gradually we shall reach agreement; the talks are good, patience is needed; the policy of the Soviet Union is correct», and they are continuing in this tone.** Naturally, this demagogy will build up even more, following the results of this meeting in Peking.

The Soviet revisionists are assisting in this direction. Moscow has ceased its attacks on China, while China is spraying them heavily with rose water. Soviet television transmitted Kosygin's meeting with Chou En-lai. **I saw this broadcast with my own eyes. When they were farewelling one another especially, they all but kissed, they shook hands like two friends who hadn't seen each other for four years and who had been longing to meet and could scarcely bear to part. Scandalous!!**

The reactionary world press is commenting extensi-

vely on this event in favour of the Soviet Union. Indeed, the commentaries say that this **«was an assistance that China gave the Soviet Union in the international arena and Gromyko can manoeuvre from a more comfortable position in the negotiations with the Americans in New York».**

A policy of «the degeneration of China» from the strategic angle, greatly interests American imperialism, but of course, when this is developed in its interests, and not in the interests of Soviet social-imperialism. There is no doubt that American imperialism will follow these results with vigilance, and the Soviets, on their part, will continue to give the Americans great assurances by making concessions to them. This is one aspect. The other aspect is that the Soviet revisionists will make every effort to widen this breach they made in the Chinese fortress, because this is necessary to them in order to consolidate the positions of the clique within the Soviet Union and to strengthen the dominant position of the Soviet Union over its satellites. Such a thing is also of interest to them in order to quell the peoples' resistance and revolutionary struggles, to direct them according to their enslaving social-imperialist ideology and to manage to revive the ill-famed «anti-imperialist front including even the revisionists». This is the old plan of Khrushchev and Liu Shao-chi and also of Chou En-lai, who defended it to us, here, in Tirana, very strongly, but one which we opposed and combated just as strongly.

We must fight with determination and vigilance against such a dangerous turn-about, if this occurs in China. We, with our open principled stands, must tell the Chinese comrades of our opinion and must hold discussions with them, because this is a general line, the same for all Marxist-Leninists, hence the Chinese comrades cannot consider it simply a Chinese problem.

Perhaps the meeting they held will not have this evil

outcome because now, after the Cultural Revolution, which crushed the revisionist clique of Liu Shao-chi, Mao and his comrades have stronger positions.

Let us hope that this meeting was only a tactic, undertaken without proper consideration and without realistically assessing the facts on which this tactic was built.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 19, 1969

THE CHINESE HAVE BEEN FRIGHTENED BY THE SOVIET BLACKMAIL

Today Comrade Rita arrived from Peking and reported to us concretely. **As in the first period of the Cultural Revolution, as in the time of Liu Shao-chi, this time, too, Chou En-lai had mounted the revisionist-opportunist horse and was tearing ahead, full of enthusiasm, at a headlong gallop.** Indeed he was striking out right and left with success. His comrades, beginning from Kang Sheng, sat and listened and never interrupted. This means that they were all in accord with what Chou En-lai was reeling off.

When Rita expressed his opinion that the meeting with Kosygin was a wrong action, Chou En-lai replied to him angrily, in an uncomradely way, **«You are extremist»**. There is no doubt that this revisionist definition of Chou En-lai's was aimed at all our leadership.

In his exposition, Chou En-lai did not take even the slightest precaution to conceal his opportunist views, full of contradictions, arranged especially in this way to give us to understand that we should reduce the tension with the Soviet Union.

Here is his reasoning:

1 — The Soviet Union is going to attack us, has massed troops, but now is not in a situation to act.

2 — The Soviet leaders are fools. Nixon has said this, too.

3 — The Soviet generals and marshals are incompetent. Nixon has said this, too.

4 — The Soviet leadership is divided into «hawks» and «doves». The Soviet Union is for peace, we must reduce the tension, assist the «doves» so that the trend to peace will triumph there and we (the Chinese) can gain time to arm ourselves, while the Soviet Union should disarm (a brilliant strategy!).

5 — The Soviet Union has lost its authority and control over its satellites. (Hence China ought to help it to regain them.)

6 — The Soviet Union was discredited at the Moscow Meeting. (Hence China ought to help it recover.)

7 — The Soviet Union must exert pressure on the United States of America. (Hence China ought to help it do this.)

After listing all these things Chou En-lai concluded that the reduction of tension is useful.

The question arises: For whom it is useful? According to Chou En-lai, for China. According to us, for the Soviet Union and the revisionist faction in China, as well as for modern revisionism throughout the world. Even children understand this, let alone political people. Imperialism, together with its agency, modern revisionism, has fought, is fighting and will fight for such positions.

Chou En-lai tried to conceal this rotten course with phraseology, with slogans or historical events of the past. But this course of his has nothing to do with the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist tactics or strategy, which cannot bear comparison with the events of the past.

Two things are clear:

1 — The Chinese are afraid and are making concessions in principle.

2 — The Chinese have been frightened by the Soviet blackmail, while the Chinese revisionist wing, disguised

behind the Cultural Revolution, knows this is a bluff and is also aware of the unconsolidated situation within the country. Therefore this revisionist wing is taking advantage of the situation to strengthen its position in the state and the party under the banner of Mao, and at the same time, is assisting its Soviet revisionist friends who are in great difficulties, both within the Soviet Union and in the international arena.

There is a great deal of talk in China about measures to prepare for war, as well as about sharpening vigilance. This is very good. Chou En-lai said this, too. But what vigilance can you call it when, first of all, you have completely lost your political and ideological vigilance?

Chou En-lai was so irritated during his talk with Comrade Rita and defended his opinion with such heat (of course, because he was angry with Rita, and obviously with our leadership that opposed his views) that, although he had invited Rita to a banquet, he did not propose any toast to our leadership. Could this have been an oversight? I don't believe so. It was pressure. When he «forgot», why did Kang Sheng not remind him?! He had many ways to do so.

The following morning both Kang Sheng and Li Hsien-nien, each of them individually, took Rita aside at the airport when he was about to leave and begged his pardon on behalf of Chou En-lai, who at the banquet the evening before «had forgotten» to propose a toast to the health of Comrade Enver, etc. They get up to such tricks.

But the refrain of the trickery continues. What I said above about Comrade Rita occurred on the 12th of September. On the 18th of September, the ambassador of China here gave a lunch for the leadership of the China-Albania Friendship Association and strangely enough, the Chinese ambassador did not propose a toast to our leadership either, although it was up to him to do such a thing.

This astounded us, because we still did not know that the same thing had occurred with Comrade Rita in Peking. But now we understand the set-up: the Chinese ambassador acted in this way so that his guests would not propose toasts to Mao Tsetung, and taking advantage of this opportunity, he would report that the Albanians did not propose a toast to Mao. Chou En-lai would report this to the leadership saying: «The Albanians are vengeful, hence we are one-all; I, Chou En-lai, did this unwittingly, while the Albanians did it deliberately». What intrigues!! There is no other explanation for these things, which should never occur.

Briefly, these are the main things which emerge from Comrade Rita's talk, although there are many other details which figure in the minutes of the meeting of our Political Bureau, which also have their importance.

We must find the way to tell the Chinese comrades our views clearly and frankly about this question which has great importance both for China and for us, and for our common general stand. We will tell them these things in a comradely way, and our aim is to help to stop this unhealthy course which can have grave consequences within China and in the world. We shall hope that the Chinese comrades, and especially Comrade Mao, will understand our criticism and aims correctly and in a comradely way.

SUNDAY
SEPTEMBER 21, 1969

THE CHINESE PROPAGANDA IS NOT FINDING STABILITY

Wherever they meet our people, the Chinese ambassadors (including the Chinese ambassador in Tirana who is saying nothing about this) pretend to be uniformed from their centre in Peking about the meeting between Chou En-lai and Kosygin. I believe that such a thing is impossible. Some Chinese ambassador, like the one in Paris, tells our ambassador: «These are the hypocritical doings of the Soviets». But the question is asked: Why did the meeting take place? And he himself gives a banal reply: «When a prime minister arrives at an airport, he is welcomed by the prime minister»! While in another country the Chinese ambassador asks our ambassador: «What is being said in diplomatic circles about this event?». The Chinese press and radio are hesitating in their propaganda against the Soviet revisionists. Sometimes they continue this propaganda, sometimes they stop it; sometimes they reduce it, sometimes they step it up; they are not finding stability. We shall see what develops.

THURSDAY
SEPTEMBER 25, 1969

HOW IS THE SOVIET BLACKMAIL TOWARDS CHINA BEING PUMPED UP?

The meeting in Peking between Chou En-lai and Kosygin is the talking point for international public opinion. The capitalist news agencies and the American and western imperialist press continue to make all sorts of speculations, all sorts of suggestions, pretending they know nothing about the content of the meetings, but still implying that they do know and allegedly can guess it, spreading slanders, giving indirect advice and proposing measures and counter-measures.

After the meeting, the Soviet press «ceased the polemic» against China for a while. The western news agencies put this «on the tip of their pens» to show the «good intentions and peaceful sentiments of the Soviet Union». Meanwhile the Chinese press did not cease the polemic, but this had nuances: Kosygin was distinguished from Brezhnev, only the latter and the renegade clique of the Kremlin were attacked, or sometimes the polemic was waged more on the economic platform than the political platform. **Rarely, or never at all, have the Soviets attacked Chou En-lai. Their attacks have been directed against Mao and Lin Piao.**

This means that a preliminary conclusion can be reached that this compromise produced a first result: «Kosygin is a reasonable man, and an economist and a

peace-lover, the talks can be commenced with him». Therefore, attacks against him by the Chinese side must cease. However there have been no attacks from the Soviets aimed at Chou En-lai. Hence the protagonists of «talks» were found and naturally «things are not easy for them», because, according to the Chinese: «Kosygin is facing furious opposition from Brezhnev and the adventurist armymen», and according to the Soviets, «Chou En-lai is facing furious opposition from Mao, Lin Piao and the adventurist armymen». Therefore, according to them, account must be taken of these facts, and the thaw must begin.

The Chinese took the first step. They do not attack Kosygin, but attack the clique of the Kremlin, while the Soviets stopped the polemic against the «clique of Mao» for two weeks. But, apparently, seeing that no progress is being made with further negotiations, Moscow began to write an occasional article against the «clique of Mao».

What is going on in the diplomatic lobbies between the Soviet Union and China over those problems about which Chou En-lai himself told Rita that discussion would be held and tension reduced? We do not know anything at all. The Chinese comrades are not giving even the slightest hint.

Will there be a continuation of the meeting in Peking? This we cannot say for certain. If things are completely in the hands of Chou En-lai, there will be, and it will be in favour of the rapprochement of China with the Soviet Union on an unhealthy anti-Marxist line. But there might not be a continuation, and this whole event will end up as a «Dead Sea apple». The Soviet bluff and blackmail will be understood and the danger of this opportunist action, which restrains the Cultural Revolution, while strengthening the positions of the Chinese revisionists internally and the other revisionists externally,

will be understood, too. And consequently such dangerous actions will be nipped in the bud and ended.

In this situation, in which we do not know the facts, the diplomats of the revisionist countries buttonhole our diplomats, and all speak to them in the same way, as if they had received one directive from a single centre, with enthusiasm about the Peking meeting, saying that «this opens fine perspectives for unity, for the struggle against imperialism»; that «you Albanians should follow the example of China», etc., etc.

They are telling all this nonsense to the Chinese ambassadors, too, of course with an even heavier «sugar-coating of praise», and these (the Chinese ambassadors) tell Chou En-lai, who takes it at its face value, that «the satellites of the Soviet Union are ready to abandon the Brezhnev clique, therefore the meeting has positive aspects, therefore...», etc., etc.

On the other hand, the Soviets are carrying out very large military manoeuvres in Poland at present. What is the meaning of these manoeuvres? — To intimidate the satellites, to say to China: «We must continue the dialogue, because for us the danger is in Europe». Or to say to the United States of America: «We shall make concessions to China, therefore you should make concessions, too». Or to imply to China: «We are capable of attacking both you and the United States of America, therefore come along, and let us continue the dialogue we began». In short, the Soviet revisionists are pumping up their blackmail and intimidation.

Meanwhile the capitalist press is singing another refrain, making a *fait accompli* of its desire: «Mao has died or is about to die, Lin Piao is sick, Chou En-lai is taking power in China, and the change towards the thaw has begun, just as it began in the Soviet Union after the death of Stalin». Bravo Chou En-lai!

Reaction exploits everything. We shall see how things will go. Yesterday the BBC said that the Chinese representative «has invited four ministers of the British Government» to attend the celebration of the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, but «they will not go because the Chinese did not go when invited to the birthday celebration of Queen Elizabeth».

One thing we do know: namely, that Chou En-lai himself said, «we have diplomatic relations with the Soviets and shall exchange ambassadors and reduce the tension; we have been holding talks with the United States of America for fifteen years; why should these things not be done with Britain, India, Indonesia?», etc.

We shall see how, on what bases, on what principles, events and things develop and then we shall pronounce our opinion on the basis of facts. Up till now we have based all our judgements on facts. And this is how we shall always act.

On the part of the Chinese, the Chou En-lai-Kosygin meeting has those same wrong political-ideological characteristics, and the same haste in action as Chou En-lai's lightning trip to Moscow after the removal of Khrushchev from the leadership. At that time, too, Chou En-lai expressed himself to our ambassador with indescribable arrogance and impatience, openly expressing the opinion: «The time has come for us to improve our relations with the Soviets».

This time, too, with that same unprecedented arrogance, Chou En-lai described Comrade Rita as «an extremist», and openly expressed the opinion, «we shall go ahead lowering the tension with the Soviets, and this is useful». On both the former and the latter occasions, Chou En-lai hid behind Mao, not forgetting to say, «we are carrying out these actions on orders from Comrade Mao Tsetung».

However, we, as Marxist-Leninists, have always stated our opinion and will continue to do so regardless of whoever else may have an opposing opinion. Only a frank, principled discussion, based on facts and reasoned in the Marxist-Leninist way can convince us and make us change our opinion, if we have been wrong, but otherwise neither demagogy, threats, nor blackmail succeed with us.

TUESDAY
SEPTEMBER 30, 1969

THE CHINESE ARE NOT TALKING ABOUT SOVIET REVISIONISM

In Peking, in the speeches and *toasts**, neither Soviet revisionism nor the Brezhnev-Kosygin clique are being mentioned, but they are talking only about social-imperialism. Meanwhile here in Tirana the Chinese ambassador speaks against Soviet revisionism without mentioning names. These are the consequences of the Kosygin-Chou En-lai meeting. **The stand which they are maintaining here may be considered «secondary», not very important, a «local stand», which, according to Chinese diplomacy, means «not annoying to the Soviets» and «satisfactory to the Albanians».**

* English in the original.

WEDNESDAY
OCTOBER 1, 1969

A TALK WITH THE CHINESE AMBASSADOR

After the Chinese ambassador had delivered his speech and proposed the toast to the 20th anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China, I opened the conversation with him about the meeting which was held in Peking between Chou En-lai and Kosygin. Apparently he expected this, because I observed that his interpreter, Who, when I was speaking a little earlier, translated everything directly, without taking notes, brought out his pen and notebook when I began to speak on this question. So much the better, but it depends how faithfully my words were translated.

Naturally, I prefaced my remarks before launching into the theme. I said more or less: Comrade Rita reported to us about the conversation he had with Comrade Chou En-lai in Peking. **We tell you sincerely, as comrades, that we do not find this unexpected meeting which Chou En-lai had with Kosygin in Peking, correct or opportune.** This meeting at such a high level, in these circumstances and moments favourable for China and unfavourable for the Soviet revisionists, seems to us a mistake. While calling this meeting a mistake for the above reasons, we do not think there should not be talks between you and the Soviets over the problems which Comrade Chou En-lai mentioned to Comrade Rita, but the talks should not have been held so hastily as that and should

have been held at a much lower level. On this occasion, and, in general, in any event, we, the Marxist-Leninists, should have the advantage, we should benefit, and not our enemies.

We consider that this hasty and inopportune action of the Chinese leadership seems to have assisted the Soviet revisionists, who are in great trouble both internally and in the international arena; they and international reaction are greatly inflating this event, naturally, in favour of the «wise, far-sighted and patient policy of the Soviet Union».

We draw these conclusions from their press, from the western news agencies and from the contacts of the diplomats of various countries, especially revisionist countries, with our diplomats. The revisionist diplomats are wallowing in great euphoria, for them «everything has been settled with China», and now «it only remains to settle things with Albania».

But we know that the China of Mao Tsetung has not settled matters with the Soviet revisionists and others, and, as it declares, will never be reconciled with them. There will be ceaseless principled ideological struggle until the total destruction of the Soviet revisionists and modern revisionism.

Then I spoke at length to the Chinese ambassador about the unity of opinions of our two parties on the basis of Marxism-Leninism. I pointed out that the frank, honest discussion of problems, which we, as Marxists, have held with Mao, with Chou En-lai, with Kang Sheng and others, has strengthened our unity. I also spoke to him about the correct line of Mao and the Communist Party of China, the Cultural Revolution, the major successes which have been achieved in China, and about our march shoulder to shoulder and inseparable, in good and stormy times.

I told him that we had to be vigilant towards the Soviet revisionist enemies and American imperialism, that

we had to be armed, and that every evil should find us well armed and together, because in this way we shall triumph.

I also expressed to the ambassador our opinion that, in these situations, at this juncture, the Soviets are not yet prepared for war against China. Today they are bluffing, exerting blackmail, in this direction.

The ambassador heard me out and thanked me in his reply. He did not know what else to say, only that, «At first I (the ambassador) did not really understand the Cultural Revolution. Later on I was convinced and have confidence in Comrade Mao, Lin Piao and Chou En-lai. We Chinese learn a great deal from you, Comrade Enver. Our friendship...», etc., etc.

The dinner continued very well, very cordially.

WEDNESDAY
OCTOBER 8, 1969

FOR THE CHINESE THE CZARS OF THE KREMLIN HAVE BECOME «FINE FELLOWS»!

Yesterday the Chinese issued a communique in which they announced that they are ready to begin talks with the Soviets, at the rank of deputy-ministers, in Peking. The communique stressed that «the Chinese have never had territorial claims on the Soviet Union». It speaks of «talks on trade and other problems».

Chou En-lai's meeting with Kosygin is yielding the fruits they desire. Naturally, their relations will be extended in the spirit of the famous «peaceful coexistence», which caused the czars of the Kremlin, the renegades, to become «fine fellows» overnight, between evening and the following morning. As the photograph of the Chou-Kosygin meeting shows, the Chinese clasped Kosygin's palm, not with one, but with both hands, not releasing it out of their ardour and longing!

I think that our press and radio should ignore the Chinese communique about the commencement of talks with the Soviets, just as they ignored the Chou En-lai-Kosygin meeting. This is because if we publicize it, we shall have to publish all that follows, and there will be no small amount of that. On the other hand, by continuing our attacks on the Soviet revisionists as usual, or more strongly, the contradictions with China in our stands will emerge more clearly. Or other variant, to publish a very, very short report. However, we have time to think about this.

TUESDAY
OCTOBER 14, 1969

CHEN PO-TA WAS CORDIAL WITH OUR DELEGATION

Comrade Haki [Toska] reported to us that, in general, he has been received well, particularly among the people and in the provinces, he has been received very well, exceptionally warmly, with affection just as before. Chen Po-ta, who accompanied him to Nanking, proved to be very friendly very cordial, very warm.

At the celebrations in Peking the «new protocol» established was somewhat in evidence. He met Mao and Lin Piao in passing on the Tien An Men tribune, because they «were very busy».

Our delegation had talks with Chou En-lai and Kang Sheng. Chou En-lai defended his views and Haki defended ours. Each side maintained its own standpoint in regard to the Chou-Kosygin meeting. On other things, the two sides were in agreement.

They parted as always «in sincere comradely affection», notwithstanding that there may be some contradiction between them. Haki reported to us on the economic developments in China and the Cultural Revolution. This greatly rejoiced us, because their successes are ours, too.

FRIDAY
OCTOBER 17, 1969

SOMETHING UNBELIEVABLE

The ambassador of China told me confidentially that in his talk with comrade Lin Piao, the latter had told him that during the Great Cultural Revolution China had achieved major successes especially in the field of the economy, so much so that «within the two coming years China will achieve the highest world levels in all branches». (!) And this he told me in all seriousness. (!) Can they be so naive?! Or do they take us for simpletons?!

SATURDAY
OCTOBER 18, 1969

THE CHINESE BECOME ADVOCATES OF TITO

At a dinner which the Chinese ambassador and his councillor gave for some workers of our press and radio on the inauguration of the Hsinhua building in Tirana, they told them, «the question that Tito is an agent of imperialism is not a contemporary issue»; while a personality of the Foreign Ministry had told Haki, in Peking, «Tito was a victim», of whom, is self-evident. Our comrades gave them the proper reply, but these tendencies of the Chinese comrades are strange. **We must be vigilant!**

WEDNESDAY
OCTOBER 29, 1969

THE OLD TACTIC IN THE POLEMIC

The Chinese have begun their old tactic. During the stay of the delegation of the Soviet Union, headed by Kuznetsov, in Peking, they ceased the polemic against the Soviet revisionists. However, a few days ago «a day after the fair», they published that part of Halim Budo's speech at the UNO in which the Soviets are exposed. According to the information which our ambassador in Peking supplies, the Soviets and the other revisionists accredited there have not been pleased with «this Chinese manoeuvre», and no doubt they «have complained». We shall see whether their «complaint has touched the hearts» of the Chinese. Will they continue the manoeuvre? Will they publish those important parts from the speech Mehmet delivered in Berat on the occasion of the 25th anniversary of the formation of the Democratic Government of Albania?

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 30, 1969

MEETING AFTER MEETING IN PEKING

For ten days the Chinese and the Soviets have been holding meeting after meeting in Peking. We «the closest allies of China» are not given the slightest information about what is being discussed with our common enemies. It seems Chou En-lai is angry that we disagreed on his view about the meeting with Kosygin and is displeased that we did not publicize this meeting. However, we can't help it, **and though this may mean the beginning of a break with them, Cho En-lai does not and never will have us with him on his course over those matters of principle on which the Chinese are wrong.** Their words sound pretty hollow when they say, «criticize us», because, in fact, if you do so, they get angry.

From the tribune of the Kremlin, the renegade Brezhnev spoke at a meeting in exalted tones about the «eternal Soviet-Czechoslovak friendship», and threw bouquets to his lackeys, the Czech quislings, Hussak, Svoboda and others, who prostrated Czechoslovakia under the heels of the Soviet occupiers. From this tribune he did not fail to speak, all softness, sweetness and affection, about the Soviet-Chinese friendship, too, about the permanent readiness of the Soviets «to see this friendship flourish and grow stronger for the good of the two peoples and socialism». He hopes that «things will go on in this way following the meeting of Comrade Kosygin with Comrade Chou En-lai». The meeting of the two comrades!!

SUNDAY
NOVEMBER 2, 1969

MYSTERY AROUND THE SINO-SOVIET TALKS IN PEKING

At a lunch which the Chinese ambassador gave here in Tirana for some of our comrades he did not say a word to them about how the talks, which are being held in Peking with the Soviets, are going. A mystery! He merely told them in confidence that «at the lunch which the Chinese had put on for the Soviets, Kuznetsov and the others ate everything that was on the table». What an ambassador! The Soviet bourgeoisie is allegedly so hungry that it waits for the Chinese lunch to placate its hunger!

Can such stupidities hold? On the other hand, they support the thesis that «the danger of the Soviet attack on China is very threatening, indeed immediate». Perhaps they want with this to justify their talks and approaches.

TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 4, 1969

THE CHINESE HAVE EVEN DROPPED THE TERM «SOCIAL-IMPERIALISM»

When Hsie Fu-jie, Member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of China, spoke at the celebration of Algeria's National Day, he altogether omitted the term «social-imperialism». Apparently, the plot is thickening in their affairs with the Soviets. The celebration at Berat and the speech which Mehmet delivered there did not figure, even as news item, either in the Hsinhua or «Renmin Ribao». This is a sing of the bad road the Chinese are taking. We must watch out!

SATURDAY
NOVEMBER 8, 1969

AT A DINNER PUT ON FOR OUR EMBASSY IN PEKING

The Political Bureau of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, Chou En-lai, Kang Sheng, Chen Po-ta, Chiang Ching, etc., put on a dinner for the personnel of our embassy in Peking on the occasion of the celebration of the October Socialist Revolution and the founding of the Party of Labour of Albania. Chiang Ching made all the conversation. Chou En-lai spoke very little, Kang Sheng even less, and Chen Po-ta not at all. The main topic of the talk was what sort of titles should be applied to Mao: «the glorious teacher», «the great teacher», or simply «the teacher». Naturally, «nothing was decided». About the Sino-Soviet talks nothing was said. They spoke ill of the Soviets. This was a good thing.

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 20, 1969

A WELL-KNOWN THEORY

The Chinese Ambassador in Tirana, Keng Piao, allegedly brought Comrade Nesti up to date about the talks between the Chinese and the Soviets in Peking. He told him: «The talks are not producing anything, although we want to conclude something, but the Soviets do not. Apart from the question of borders nothing else is being discussed». That was all he told him, and then he went on to speak for half an hour about the need for talks, and twisted the question, saying: **«The Poles have done this, too, and Stalin acted in this way with Hitler in order to gain time.** We, too, want to gain time, to arm ourselves, because the Soviets are going to attack us». The same old refrain!

SUNDAY
NOVEMBER 23, 1969

IS LI HSIEN-NIEN THE ONLY ONE WHO SHOULD COME TO ALBANIA?

Today Peking announced that the Chinese delegation, which will come to take part in our celebration of the 25th anniversary of the Liberation of our Homeland, will be headed by Li Hsien-nien. This is the fourth or the fifth time that Li Hsien-nien has been sent at the head of the Chinese delegations which come to our country, as if great China allegedly has no other comrades who ought to come and see Albania, too. This is astounding, to say the least. This is not important to us, but we wonder, ought Li Hsien-nien be the only one to come to Albania? He will stay here only a week and in fact will have only one day free to travel through Albania. Let him go to see the Vau i Dejës hydro-power station, which he has not seen!

WEDNESDAY
DECEMBER 3, 1969

LI HSIEN-NIEN DID NOT HOLD ANY POLITICAL CONVERSATION WITH OUR COMRADES

Li Hsien-nien came and will depart as dumb as a fish. He did not open up even the very slightest political conversation with our comrades. We thought he would say something in the meeting he had with me, but he said nothing, although I gave the conversation a political and very friendly turn. He introduced the members of the delegation to me one by one, regardless of the fact that I knew them, and finally said with utter shamelessness: «When I went to Rumania, at the airport they asked me: How are the talks with the Soviets going? And I replied that the Soviets don't want these talks to be made public». After saying this and nothing more, Li Hsien-nien looked at his watch and asked to be excused because, he said, «You are very busy». The same thing occurred at all the manifestations, including their exhibition, where, as the authoritative person he is, he could have spoken about the economy of China. There are two things here: either he has been advised to adopt this stand, or he is afraid to speak because he has taken a beating in the Cultural Revolution. But if the latter is the case, why send us this mummy?! We asked him to hold talks, but he refused this, too, saying: «From our side we have nothing new». Seeing how things stood, we dropped the

matter. But we have the better of them in everything. They remained disgraced and equivocal.

This evening we put on a farewell dinner for Li Hsien-nien, who spoke in the usual formulas. No idea was put forward, no problem was raised on his part.

THURSDAY
DECEMBER 4, 1969

IDEAS WHICH ARE NOT LI HSIEN-NIEN'S ALONE

In his conversation on the way to Fier, Li Hsien-nien hinted to Mehmet that they are preparing for war, hence war industry occupies the main place in China, that the Chinese are assisting South Vietnam and North Vietnam, which has been heavily damaged, and that they (the old refrain) are worried about the labour force in our country, lest we are impoverishing the countryside! On his part, all this «discourse» was made in order to tell us: «Don't seek any more aid from us». He stressed that the things he was saying were «his own opinions», of which he has many, but none of which he had expressed up till then. We know that these are not only his opinions. Mehmet gave him the proper reply.

FRIDAY
DECEMBER 5, 1969

EVIL AND PROVOCATIVE AIMS

In Fier, the deputy-leader of the Chinese delegation (the armyman) committed a base provocation. With utter shamelessness, he said to Haki: «You dress well and eat well, while look at us, we dress in cotton suits». And Haki replied to him as he deserved. «This suit I am wearing,» he said, «is neither wool nor cotton, but synthetic. Your suit is cotton drill and if you will allow me (and he pulled up the trouserleg a little), these that you are wearing (long underpants), and that singlet you have under your shirt are of wool, while I (Haki pulled up the leg of his trousers) do not have such things. Under my shirt (and he undid one button of the shirt), as you see, I have only a sleeveless cotton singlet. Neither do I have a woollen pullover. Hence your clothing is more expensive than mine. As to what we eat,» he told him, «if you draw conclusions from the dinners which we put on for friends like you, I can say that when I have gone to China, the Chinese comrades did not know what to do to make me eat more, and the tables were loaded. But you are wrong on the two questions which you raise, because not only are we against luxury, but we are extremely economical and rational in the use of things.»

On the other hand, Li Hsien-nien, in passing, tried

to put the responsibility on Mehmet for allegedly refusing discussions, while it was he, himself, who refused them.

This Chinese delegation has been the most negative, the worst, with evil and provocative aims. But we did not lose our aplomb.

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 6, 1969

LI HSIEN-NIEN AND HIS DELEGATION

We expected that a delegation worthy of the deep, pure, and sincere feelings, the great love we have for People's China, its Communist Party and Chairman Mao, would come to our great celebration of the 25th anniversary of Liberation from our «great, beloved, Marxist-Leninist» ally.

What did they send us? Who came at the head of the delegation? A gloomy individual, a person who is criticized so severely by the Cultural Revolution, that we are astonished that he remains where he is (only in China do these «miracles» occur even when such «revolutions» are being carried out), a person who has never shown himself to be sincere and well-intentioned towards the People's Republic of Albania and the Marxist-Leninist line of our Party. This person was Li Hsien-nien, the friend and righthand man of Chou En-lai, who certainly not only saved him from the purges, but kept him where he was before, and indeed increased his «renown» and power even further.

Hence, Li Hsien-nien came to Albania rather as the envoy of Chou En-lai than as the envoy of the Communist Party of China. He acted and behaved here up to Chou En-lai's instructions and orders. He behaved towards us much worse than Chou En-lai himself would have behaved, because this one is very clever, very diplomatic.

While Li Hsien-nien's face as well as his words, his actions, his attitudes, his gestures showed clearly what he had in his heart and mind. His mission was very adverse, evil, provocative and unfriendly.

Thus the Chinese delegation was negative from every point of view. It was only due to the good work and organization on our part that no hint of this got out to the public. In contrast to this stand, which we noticed immediately, we maintained a lofty stand, friendly about everything and in every aspect. However, the members of the delegation found the way and created the opportunity (without cause) to provoke us.

Of course we understand these manifestations. They are not fortuitous, but are remote manifestations of contradictions of principle which may exist internally in China and in the Communist Party of China, manifestations of the fierce struggle between groups which have not been eliminated in China, but, on the contrary, are developing, becoming more antagonistic and have repercussions on us and on their stands towards us.

In China there are people, disguised revisionists, who are not in agreement with the correct, consistent, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist line of our Party, who are not in agreement with the prestige and authority which our Party has won and is winning, day by day, in the international communist movement. They are striving in vain to make us accept certain principles and stands which are politically and ideologically wrong, both on their internal plane and on the international plane, in order to give the impression that our Party is tailing behind their party and to make it *de facto* an appendage of their party.

Of course, we do not easily fall into such traps. We not only defend the independence and individuality of our Party, but also we defend our line and develop it on

the Marxist-Leninist road. Such a development automatically brings to light our contradictions with them on many questions.

We have not failed to point out our views on many things in a comradely way. They have accepted them, have not rejected them, because our views have been well-founded and principled, but in essence they have not been pleased. They appear modest, but they are not very modest, especially certain leaders of the Communist Party of China. They ask for criticisms, but in fact they are very embittered at our criticism, especially certain leaders who even bear grudges and take revenge if they get the opportunity.

However, it is a fact that all these contradictions have not given rise to open antagonisms, apart from the open opposition we had when they attempted on two successive occasions to make us reach agreements with the Soviets. We opposed this rigorously. On both occasions they acted as they thought fit, but, in the end, returned to our course. This, naturally, has made some Chinese leaders angry with us because we did not follow them, and it wounded their pride that, as the «great leaders of a great party», they had to adopt the course and opinions of a «small», but «disobedient party».

The Chinese comrades were not pleased and became so angry that Chou En-lai called us «sectarian», because we did not agree on and did not approve of his meeting with Kosygin in Peking, while on the other hand, we expressed the opinion that «talks should be held to settle the border question, but at a low level». The Chinese were offended and claimed persistently that «this was a decision of Mao Tsetung». **However, we can be in opposition even to this decision of Mao Tsetung.** They cannot conceive of such a thing, although throughout their lives, in conspiratorial and open ways, they have frequently

been and are against the entire line of Mao Tsetung. Mao may have taken this decision, but the suggestion and desire to meet the Soviets, had come from others.

However, we are not making a tragedy out of this question, we, I myself, as well as Comrade Rita and Comrade Haki, who were in Peking, told them our opinion dispassionately, in a warm comradely way. They went their way and we went ours and ignored this problem. They stopped the polemic with the Soviets, but after a month of silence they came back to our course, and resumed the polemic. Apparently, the meeting yielded no results.

We think that some Chinese leaders have not forgotten this stand of ours, but they had no reason to express their ire so openly through the delegation they sent to our celebration. However, nothing can alter the great love we have for China, a love which is based on the principles of proletarian internationalism. It was all the same to us whoever would come to the celebration, but knowing Li Hsien-nien, and since it was the fifth time he came to our country, we had the right to doubt and say: «Has China no other comrade to send us on this great day?! Has China no one left but Li Hsien Nien?!». It was our duty to make him very welcome, but also we had to be careful.

How did Li Hsien-nien behave in face of the great enthusiasm of the people, the cadres, and our leading comrades? As cold as ice, he barely greeted them, was frowning; did not speak if he was not spoken to; when we tried to open conversation with him, he replied, with a «yes», «no», and with stale formulas. He never mixed with the people, never shook hands with anybody of the people; he refused the joint talks and provoked Mehmet to it as if it were we who refused; he did everything to imply that they could not help us. His comrade provoked Haki, saying, «you dress and eat well, while we dress in cot-

ton suits». They had not included Haki in the list to visit their exhibition, and likewise upon leaving Tirana, Li Hsien-nien did not shake hands with Haki and many other base stands like this.

But why this unfriendly stand, to say the least of it?! This was a premeditated stand prepared in advance. Why? Whom does it serve? And for what reason?!

Without any doubt this stand is dictated by Chou En-lai, we believe, because Li Hsien-nien is his man. We have always had friction over line with Chou En-lai. Mao saved Chou from the Cultural Revolution. **Chou himself says that he has made great mistakes. He says this with his mouth, but not with his heart. This is the issue, and this is the basis of the opposition to us, opposition over line, this is the foundation of it. Then events happen one after the other and prove that we are right and not he, and this has made him angry with us.**

Can it be our opposition to the Chou En-lai—Kosygin meeting which dictated this stand of Li Hsien-nien?! **Partly yes, but not entirely. There must be something bigger concealed and this must have its source in an internal struggle, which must be going on in their leadership.**

From what do we draw these deductions? Apart from other major questions of principled importance, we should stop to consider certain signs which do not strike the eye af first sight, but which, on reflection, assume another significance.

What are these signs?

On the list of invitations to the Chinese exhibition which the Chinese Embassy provided, Haki had been left out. We said: «This is an oversight». The provocation by the deputy-leader of the delegation, which I mentioned above, was carried out against Haki in particular. When Li Hsien-nien was being farewelled our whole Political Bureau had lined up at the airport. Li Hsien-nien shook

hands with all of us but not with Haki. Then these things were no longer accidental.

Why this stand towards Haki? What had occurred with Haki in China? Haki had behaved there like an outstanding Marxist-Leninist, had expressed his love for China, for Mao, the Cultural Revolution, etc. In talks Haki is very patient, correct, wise, and well-behaved. If the talks became somewhat heated, and correctly so from our side, this occurred when Comrade Rita talked with Chou En-lai, who behaved extremely arrogantly towards him. But if some resentment had remained, how do we explain that they did not take a stand against Rita but against Haki?

Why against Haki? The whole matter must stand like this: **At the first meeting with Haki, both Kang Sheng and Chou En-lai said, «The only comrade who has not been to Albania is Chen Po-ta». At this moment Chen Po-ta said with great enthusiasm: «It would be a great joy for me to come to Albania», and Haki invited him to our celebration. Chen Po-ta accompanies a foreign delegation on a visit to China for the first time, and this is our delegation headed by Haki. Chen Po-ta, who usually does not speak, was bubbling with conversation with Haki. He spoke with exceptionally warm affection about our Party and us, sternly criticized their own work, remained alone with Haki and our interpreter.**

All these stands, so warm, so correct, comradely and Marxist-Leninist of Chen Po-ta towards us were certainly reported to Chou En-lai, who did not welcome them and immediately showed this openly at the joint meeting, when Chen Po-ta left it in the middle of Chou En-lai's talk because «he had a pain in the stomach».

When Li Hsien-nien landed in Tirana, in listing the leadership one by one, without even forgetting the commas, as is their custom, two or three times running, he

forgot Chen Po-ta. Our comrades noticed this, but said: «forgetfulness». However in the light of this reasoning I have just made, these things are linked.

Hence I think that the unfriendly stand of Li Hsien-nien, dictated by the group of Chou En-lai, was intended to let us know that «they are not in agreement with the activity of Chen Po-ta and Haki».

And what did Haki and Chen Po-ta do, apart from cementing the ardent Marxist-Leninist love between Albania and China, between the Communist Party of China and the Party of Labour of Albania, between our people and the Chinese people, and Mao Tsetung? But these individuals are afraid of the light of the sun.

Of course Chen Po-ta wanted to come to us, but Chou En-lai found the way to send Li Hsien-nien, because he knows how to transmit Chou's directives well. Li Hsien-nien will do this when he returns to China, too. Li Hsien-nien will distort all this love, sincerity and enthusiasm of the people, the Party and ours, for China and Mao, and paint it black.

We shall always triumph because we are on the right course and out in the open. We shall smash the intrigue. Let Li Hsien-nien report what he likes, lies and intrigues have short legs.

SATURDAY
DECEMBER 6, 1969

CHINA SHOULD NOT INVOLVE ITSELF WITH TRIFLES IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA

The revolutionary struggle of China in the international arena should aim at major objectives and not engage in trifles such as how to exchange ambassadors with Yugoslavia. Whether or not the People's Republic of China should have an ambassador in Yugoslavia is not a matter of weight. The contradictions must be exploited but one must not engage in petty things and forget the major ones. It devolves on China to tackle the major problems in two directions:

1) In the direction of exploiting the contradictions between the Americans and the Soviets. The contradictions between them are over the question of opposition to China, the domination of the world and the division of the spheres of influence. Hence their domination of the world and the division of the spheres of influence should be attacked. By doing this we have ruined their plans of war and aggression.

2) The most sensitive spots in the colonial empires of the United States of America and the Soviet Union should be attacked. Where are their sensitive spots? Naturally, the main ones in Europe are neither Yugoslavia nor Rumania, but Federal Germany and France. The other sensitive spots in the world, where the interests of the two superpowers clash, are the Near East (the Arab

peoples), the African continent, India, Indochina, Indonesia, and Japan. China should attack in all these directions on the Marxist-Leninist road, and not allow the imperialist powers to act at ease. It must ruin their plans. It is necessary that the peoples of the world see the great liberation policy of the People's Republic of China.

Simply to carry on trade with the capitalist states is not sufficient. Trade must serve politics. China has already lost a great deal of time in this direction and continues to do so. Despite its great prestige, it is acting in an inert manner. If China were to act in a vigorous, militant way in the international arena the results would be colossal. I think there should be actions in two directions on its part: in the direction of the revolutionary aid, which should be given to the peoples and the revolutionary Marxist-Leninist parties, and in the direction of watching the policy of bourgeois imperialist states, and working actively to sabotage it.

The Soviets and Americans are trying to consolidate their respective positions in Europe, to preserve the status quo, while attempting to resolve the contradictions within their camps. Of course, among these contradictions those which are the main ones must be found and seen in their development and dynamism.

In the pack of revisionists, there are contradictions among the Soviets, the Poles, the Germans and the Czechs. At present the contradictions of the Soviets with the German Democratic Republic should be watched, because they may become acute. Later, the same thing may occur with Poland. In the imperialist camp, it is very important to follow the development of the policies of Bonn and Paris. Bonn is smiling to either side, but is penetrating in the East to split and encircle the German Democratic Republic and to gobble it up. Then the «smile» will turn to a snarl.

At the Hague meeting, at present, France is showing signs of a softening towards Britain, the permanent ally of the United States of America. At the same meeting Italy is associated with Bonn to exert pressure on France. These questions are developing. We must be vigilant, watch, and act.

China has the possibilities and ought to do a great deal in this direction. It seems to me that the fact that it exchanged ambassadors with Belgrade has little importance. We do not know what China is doing and how it is acting, because it does not give us the possibility to hold talks. Li Hsien-nien who has come to our country also told us that «they had nothing to discuss». However, at the farewell dinner, I managed to express some of these ideas for him to transmit them to Mao.

1970

TUESDAY
JANUARY 6, 1970

NO SMOKE WITHOUT FIRE

The Chinese comrades in Peking told our comrades, «Now some of our ships will come to Albania from the northern ports of China, via the Taiwan Straits»!! Our comrades said: «But how?! The American 7th Fleet and the Chiang Kai-shek navy are patrolling there, is there no danger of incidents?» But the Chinese comrades replied: «We must follow the teachings of Mao and not fear the imperialists», etc. It seems that the meetings of the Chinese and American ambassadors in Warsaw have yielded some first result. There is no smoke without fire. One night the Japanese news agency went further, saying, «The American 7th Fleet no longer patrols the Taiwan waters»!!

WEDNESDAY
JANUARY 7, 1970

SINO-AMERICAN TALKS AT AMBASSADORIAL LEVEL

The Chinese comrades have recommenced the «talks» in Warsaw at ambassadorial level with the United States of America, which they had suspended long ago during the Cultural Revolution. The meetings are no longer being held in the Polish building, that is, they are not subject to Polish control and bugging, at least in principle, but are being held in the embassies of China and the United States of America respectively.

This naturally is greatly intriguing the Soviet revisionists, who do not look kindly on these talks, indeed they are afraid of them. They hastily dispatched Kuznetsov to Peking. The three states are manoeuvring to intrigue. **If China is making no concessions** it is doing very well that it is acting as a wedge, exploiting the contradictions and disturbing the waters.

FRIDAY
JANUARY 9, 1970

AN ANALYSIS WHICH MAO OUGHT TO MAKE

It should be made clear:

1) **What are the characteristics of the Cultural Revolution in China, and what are its international characteristics, analysed according to Lenin's definition of the characteristics of the Great October Socialist Revolution.**

2) **When one speaks of imperialism, an up-to-date analysis should be made, continuing the analysis which Lenin made of imperialism.** I think that Mao Tsetung should do this for the Cultural Revolution in particular.

Has he done this already? Not yet, it seems. We have seen no such material. It is said that he delivered «important» speeches at the 9th Congress of the party, but not a word of them has leaked outside. Lin Piao's report to the 9th Congress is not of the nature I have in mind, and neither are the usual articles which have been written during the past three years in the Chinese press. Since the Chinese comrades are constantly saying that «this revolution has international significance», and the «Marxist-Leninists should be inspired by it», it seems to me that Mao ought to do this.

MONDAY
JANUARY 26, 1970

THE OPENING UP OF CHINESE FOREIGN POLICY

I think that one of China's main objectives in Asia ought to be the opening up of its policy, in the first place, towards Japan. Japan is the Bonn Germany of the Far East. Since the time of the Second World War and after it the Americans have worked and are striving to keep Japan under their domination. The «domination» continues, but now it has been transformed into political influence and close, interdependent economic relations. However, after breaking out of the American restrictions to a certain extent, Japan is now making efforts for economic penetration into other countries competing even with the United States of America itself. But it is not making the same noise about «independence» which Federal Germany is making in Europe. Of course, Japan is not sitting idle. It is taking cautious steps.

The Soviets are making advances to Japan, receiving credits from it and giving it concessions in Siberia. Japan is of interest to them economically, as well as politically and militarily, because they are isolating China. This is of economic interest to the Japanese, because they find a place for expansion, exert pressure on China, and, taking advantage of the Soviet-American alliance, try to escape the American grip in this way.

The Americans cannot keep Japan in chains for ever. However, wanting to have it as a pawn and as the only

serious strategic base in their preparations for an eventual war against China, they are obliged to work to frustrate the Soviet plans and aims towards Japan. However, the probability exists that Japan will not become the tool of either one or the other, since it knows that in this case, as the third imperialist aggressor, its gains will be hypothetical.

If we accept this probability, China as a major power, with great political, economic and military potential, ought to open up its foreign policy towards Japan. Japan needs to conduct trade, needs markets, and for Japan, China is the land of its dreams in this direction. If the Chinese begin to move towards Japan, first through trade, then by exchanging ambassadors, the present status quo in the Far East will begin to collapse. Breaches will begin to open up in the Soviet-Japanese wall as well as in the American-Japanese wall. China will emerge actively in the political and economic arena and this will have consequences for the strategy of the war which the Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists are preparing. With these actions of the Chinese, the Japanese pawn can no longer be as manoeuvrable as it has been before, the chances that the United States of America will be able to use Japan as and when it wants, as a base for attack on China, as it used it in the Korean war, will be reduced. This advance of the Chinese towards Japan is appropriate now, because they have begun the talks at ambassadorial level in Warsaw with the United States of America. This could make it easier for the Japanese to advance, too.

As we know, the Soviet revisionists carried out military provocations on the border with China, and, for purposes of blackmail and intimidation, dispatched a million troops to Mongolia and the Sinkiang borders. The meeting between Chou En-lai and Kosygin was held (over which

we were not in agreement, while Chou En-lai had hopes and became angry with us over this, etc.), but it boiled down to nothing. Then Mao gave the order that the whole people should prepare for war against a Soviet revisionist agression or an imperialist aggression. And the preparations are great. This is frightening the Soviets, for, not only is it complicating things for them internally, but it is creating crises for them abroad. The Soviets either have to prepare themselves seriously to attack, and in that case astounding things will occur within the country economically and politically, or they will demonstrate that all this was a bluff. In fact, the whole policy of the Soviet Union is in crisis in Europe, the Near East and the Far East.

China ought to deepen the crisis which has gripped Soviet revisionism, and has all the possibilities to do so. It should act vigorously, intelligently, and with all its means, in all parts of the world, to condemn Soviet revisionism, and not only in the direction of Japan, from which military dangers may come, but also in the direction of India, which is less dangerous militarily, very weak economically and militarily. With India it is sufficient for China to develop relations to such an extent as not to affect its good relations with Pakistan, which is in conflict with India. With the Soviet Union China should continue this hard line, in order to isolate it from every angle, indeed it can study and further deepen the contradictions between the Soviet Union and Poland, because, although in appearance the Gomulka group seems to have good relations with the Soviets, in fact it is opposed to them. The squabbles with Poland completely upset the Soviet plan. I shall find the moment to suggest these matters to the Chinese ambassador so that he reports them to Peking.

MONDAY
JUNE 22, 1970

THE CHINESE TALK ABOUT «THE RUMANIAN PLANS IN THE BALKANS»

Kadri [Hazbiu] returned from China and reported to us.

He had talks with Chou En-lai and Kang Sheng, among the main leaders who met him, and later with other leaders of lower rank. According to Kadri, his welcome was warm and friendly and they said good words about Albania and our Party.

The conversation made by Chou En-lai, at which Kang Sheng was also present, contained nothing new, only general ideas and phrases which are developed at greater length in the newspaper «Renmin Ribao», although the meeting had a high level character. No political assessment was given by the Chinese on a number of main problems in their activity:

1) Nothing about their visit to Korea and their assessment of this question.

2) Nothing about the talks with the Rumanian Bodnaras.

3) Nothing about the state of the talks with the Soviets or about their further development.

4) Nothing about the development of the situation in Indochina.

On these four problems, if not on others, we should have been given information, since the Chinese took the

trouble to organize a high level meeting. If they were going to tell us nothing, why was this meeting held? It was the duty of the Chinese comrades to inform us about the talks with the Soviets, and the Rumanians especially.

We believe they have held lengthy and, indeed, cordial political and organizational talks with Bodnaras. Apparently, Chou En-lai is enthusiastic about the «skilful and resolute» revisionist policy which Bodnaras presented to him. Since the Chinese are telling us nothing, but indirectly we heard that they made the Rumanians a gift of about 50 million yuan, since they plan to give them armaments factories (Kang Sheng said this, adding that, «Later you (Albanians) may get arms from the Rumanians»), we have reason to think that the two sides have talked at length about «the Rumanian plans in the Balkans». These plans consist of «the Rumanian-Yugoslav-Albanian alliance» and other dirty revisionist deals unacceptable to us, but pleasant to Chou En-lai, provided only that these alliances and friendships are against the Soviets, while as to who Tito and Ceausescu are, that does not worry Chou.

However, we do not swallow this broth of Chou's, who thinks that, in the present situation, we are slipping from our correct principled Marxist-Leninist stand to what he desires. Chou takes his desires for reality, but they will never be realized because we shall never step on a rotten plank. Tito and Titoism are enemies of Marxism-Leninism, they are anti-socialist and anti-Albanian. As revisionists the Titoites collaborate closely with the Americans, today they have some contradictions with the Soviet revisionists, tomorrow they smooth them out. Our stands towards the peoples of Yugoslavia today are correct and principled, they also assist the Albanians of Kosova to strengthen their positions against great-Serb chauvinism, while at the same time, becoming a defence for the People's Republic of Albania.

Of course, we shall not agree that the Rumanian revisionists should «supply us with weapons», because we cannot make the fate of our defence dependent on them, who are linked closely with Tito and the Americans at present, and tomorrow will reach agreement with the Soviet revisionists (if ever they have fallen out with them). All Chou En-lai's hopes in this direction are in vain.

It was not correct, indeed it was an utterly revisionist idea Which Chou En-lai expressed to Kadri, namely, «We are fighting Soviet revisionism by fighting American imperialism». This means in other words that we should cease the polemic. Thinking that the translation had not been accurate, Kadri asked for this phrase to be repeated, but no, the translation was in order. Such a thing demonstrates nothing but the traditional zig-zags of Chou En-lai. We regret this greatly. However, they are continuing their polemic with the Soviets. Why do they speak in this way, without control, while on other things great control is exerted to ensure that nothing at all is said?

However, these are their ideas, we have our own. We shall try to convince them on those issues over which we disagree with the Chinese comrades.

DURRËS, TUESDAY
JULY 7, 1970

WE DO NOT LEAD OUR HOMELAND INTO REVISIONIST TRAPS

Rumania's Ceausescu, Tito's ally, has taken upon himself to play the role of the only person in a position to realize the «unity of the socialist countries in their ideological diversity».

In one of his recent speeches, this revisionist flew a *ballon d'essai** for deception.

The Soviet revisionists, are continuing their feverish efforts to encircle and gobble up Rumania, whereas on his part, Ceausescu pretends that he is the «architect of the unity» so much desired by the revisionists. Of course, alliance with and reliance on Tito and the «communism» of the latter failed to help Ceausescu pass his dub coin for gold, therefore he relies on his «friendship with China». The question of «unity» for the revisionists lies here: **Who among them will manage to «soften» China's policy and bring it closer to his line.**

China is being guided by the principle: «Approaches should be made to anyone who is anti-Soviet, the contradictions should be exploited». The exploitation of contradictions must not be neglected, but this must be done without ever forgetting with whom you have to do, without failing to take account of the current circumstances and

* Test balloon (French in the original).

thinking that you are exploiting the contradictions by urging this or that revisionist into temporary opposition to the Soviet revisionists. These contradictions among the revisionists may even be continuous because they are capitalists; however the exploitation of the contradictions in our favour must have as its aim not the strengthening of one side or the other to the detriment of socialism, but the weakening and exposure of the two sides.

The Rumanian revisionists are developing a clear anti-Marxist internal and foreign policy. They are up to their ears in debt to the United States of America, West Germany, France, and other capitalist countries. Naturally, these states provide credits when they see they will make economic and political gains. This is the basis of Ceausescu's «independent» policy. Independent of whom? Independent of the Soviet revisionists who are not reconciled to this situation. Meanwhile Ceausescu, the consolidation of whose capitalist regime, «independent» of the Soviet capitalist revisionists, and dependent on American and western capitalists, is in jeopardy, pretends that socialism in Rumania is being threatened, and therefore, he is seeking support and friendship from China, us, etc.

This situation is clear to us, but not so clear to the Chinese. They have the illusion and believe that the Rumanian leaders are «fine fellows, strong men, resolutely anti-Soviet». We shall support the Rumanian people if they are threatened with invasion by the Soviets, but as for the other things, the countless proposals which the Rumanian leaders make about Balkans and international policy, we shall not support them at all. They are revisionist in everything, they are at one with the policy of Tito and trying to achieve what Tito failed to achieve and penetrate where Tito failed to penetrate. Ceausescu is a card which can still be played in the hands of the Americans. (Who knows, perhaps of the Soviets, too?)

The Chinese have been and are enthusiastic about the Rumanians. Bodnaras went there recently and told them a fine tale, indeed so fine that when Emil said to Mao, «If the Russians attack us we shall allow them to penetrate deeply and then crush them» (a thesis of Mao's), Mao said, «Bravo!»

After his visit to China, Bodnaras emerged not only as an «accomplished politician and military strategist» but also as an «ardent pro-Chinese», an «ardent opponent of the Soviets», and certainly pledged to mediate with his close friend, Tito. Thus, «poor Emil» secured the friendship of China, secured a gift of 50 million yuan, secured arms factories, opened the way for the Rumanian minister of defence to go to Peking to secure other aid, etc., etc. There are rumours here and there that Chou En-lai may go to Rumania, too. All these and other actions of the Chinese are on the line of Ceausescu and do not constitute a cautious, well-studied support which assists our strategy.

Blatantly incorrect, also, is Chou En-lai's old idea according to which, «you Albanians, who are on the anti-Soviet platform, when the Soviets threaten Yugoslavia, can form a military agreement with Tito», an idea which we immediately rejected, as well as the proposal of arms supplies from Rumania, which was made to us by Kang Sheng, allegedly as a man engaged in party questions (but on the suggestion of Chou, in order to imply that this was not the idea of Chou En-lai alone but of the Whole leadership, that is, of Mao, first of all). **Hence the Chinese are dreaming and planning that Yugoslavia, Rumania and Albania will come to terms against the Soviets. We do not swallow this, Chinese comrades, we do not fall into these revisionist traps, do not place our Homeland in the mouth of wolves. Neither you nor Tito nor Ceausescu fool us in the least.** We shall try to open your

eyes to these mistaken plans, or these wrong tactics, which, we at least can say you are developing and which you must abandon, and be more vigilant.

Kang Sheng himself told our ambassador: «Don't be surprised if we turn on a magnificent welcome for some prince, don't be surprised if we welcome delegations from the French Government, don't be surprised if we welcome some Soviet delegation, but with you Albanians we are comrades-in-arms»! Why are these declarations made by Kang Sheng?! What are they preparing?! Softening? Cessation of their struggle?

We see that the Chinese are zealously sending their ambassadors to Yugoslavia, the Soviet Union and elsewhere. This appears normal, but what is hidden behind it?

For the Chinese, Kim Il Sung has now become the «great leader». The Chinese are easily enthused. At present, Kim Il Sung might have some contradictions with the Soviets, which, of course, must be utilized, but he is still maintaining normal relations with the Soviet revisionists, and we must not be surprised that he is exploiting this rapprochement with the Chinese towards the Soviets.

All these things, of course, compel us to be very vigilant and to carefully consider the steps we take because, in the situations which the revisionists and the Chinese comrades are creating, our correct stands appear sectarian to them. How can they fail to appear as such to those who see them through liberal and revisionist spectacles, and those who change tactics into wrong strategy, and in one way or another, demand that others, too, act as they do? No, we shall not fall into errors, whether some like it or not. We shall go straight ahead on the Marxist-Leninist road.

DURRËS, FRIDAY
JULY 24, 1970

TODAY THE SINO-RUMANIAN ALLIANCE, PERHAPS LATER THE CHINESE ALLIANCE WITH TITO

The Rumanian minister of defence has gone to Peking. This revisionist is welcomed with great honours by the Chinese.

The Rumanian ambassador in Peking told our chargé d'affaires that at first the minister of defence had intended to stay three days on a simple courtesy visit on his way back from Korea, but was asked by the Chinese to stay 10 days because important talks would be held.

One day earlier, a certain director of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China told our chargé d'affaires: «Now that the Rumanian minister of defence is coming, it has been decided to give Rumania factories for aircraft, tanks, missiles, artillery, heavy machine-guns, etc. **A secret agreement is to be made with the Rumanians, also».** Things have reached the point of secret agreements! But what sort of agreement it is, what character it has, we do not know, because they did not tell us.

As it appears, the Chinese are not limiting themselves only to giving Rumania minor aid, but are certainly extending this to the political sphere, and why not, the ideological sphere, too, since they are supplying it with arms and even reaching secret agreements?

Naturally, everything will come out very soon. The

illusions of the Chinese are in vain, because the Rumanians are interested that the Soviet revisionists, first of all, should hear about the armaments they are receiving and the agreements which are being signed. It needs no brains to realize that the Soviet revisionists will be furious, and we can say that the Chinese have found «reliable and suitable» people to use these weapons.

In regard to maintaining the secrecy, Bodnaras went to Tito and reported on his negotiations with the Chinese, and it is very likely that he pleaded the cause of Tito to the Chinese. There is every possibility that Tito will have a share in the manufacture of these armaments, or **later we may even see a «Chinese alliance with Tito»**, which will advance together with the Sino-Rumanian alliance. Anything is possible when you plunge into dirty revisionist waters. The smiles of Tito and the Yugoslavs in our direction are not without ulterior motives. They want to advance to the improvement of relations with us as quickly as possible. The Rumanian ambassador, who accompanied a delegation of the trade-unions of Rumania, told our comrades at a dinner that whoever is on good terms with Albania is on good terms with China, too.

We also understand the sudden change in the leader of the Rumanian trade-union delegation who, although we did not receive him, expressed a thousand eulogies about me, as if nothing had occurred. The Rumanians have a purpose in behaving in this way, but we understand their aims. We also understand the aims of the Chinese comrades, although on the question of their line they do not inform us, or inform us indirectly, or inform us in passing at a corner of some corridor, through some tenth-rate functionary of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

A member of a Rumanian delegation told one of our comrades: At the time when Rumania was threatened with invasion by the Soviets, Tito met Ceausescu in Djerdap and signed a secret agreement, under which Tito would send the army up to Bucharest to help Rumania. I doubt whether this is true, because Tito knows the Rumanian leaders well and does not risk himself for them so readily. To make a symbolic defence in words is something Tito does, but to come out against the Soviets with arms for the Rumanians is something he does not do. This is my opinion about this tricky revisionist.

However, what the Rumanian told us «in confidence», Bodnaras told Mao, Chou En-lai and Lin Piao in confidence, too, and I am sure that they have swallowed it and even said, «Bravo, Tito!». They may also have built new tactics and strategy of work with these cocky revisionists and «rabid enemies» of the Soviet revisionists who have quarrels with them today, but who tomorrow will kiss them and go to bed with them. The Chinese will be left alone lamenting. Perhaps they will say: What did we lose out of all this? Only a few armaments factories.

No, this is not the issue. If it were just a question of the armaments factories, although they are not putting them to good hands, either from the aspect of courage, or stability, or from the political and ideological aspect, we do not oppose their being given to the Rumanians. If China has them, let it give them, but it is fair that it should first take account of its true friends. The problem lies in the hopes which are placed, in the trust which exists, which is being created and strengthened on the Chinese side, in these revisionist leaders, betrayers of Marxism-Leninism. And why? Simply because they have contradictions with the Soviet revisionists!

Betancourt who was in China, declared in Paris that

Chou En-lai is to make a visit to France in the future. This is another question which we shall follow to see how it develops. We must follow everything, we must be vigilant on everything, because the lofty interests of the people and the Party require this.

DURRËS, SUNDAY
JULY 26, 1970

TITO IS PLAYING HIS «PRO-CHINESE» CARD SKILFULLY

The revisionists are crowing: «We are improving relations with China, steadily eliminating our disagreements, and this is necessary because we have a common enemy — imperialism, and must put aside what divides us and pursue what unites us.» The Hungarians and likewise the East Germans and the Czechs are speaking in these terms.

Of course, the exchange of new ambassadors between China and the Soviet Union, Yugoslavia, Hungary and Poland, and tomorrow Bulgaria, East Germany and Czechoslovakia, opens the way to these «perspectives». The Hungarians, not to mention the Rumanians and the Yugoslavs, are enthusiastic. They are pleased that their trade has increased with China, which they regard as a market on which to dump the goods which do not sell, and thus, foster illusions among the Chinese about the deepening of contradictions with the Soviets, contradictions which exist in fact, but which simply serve the Hungarian anti-Marxists to link themselves more closely with Tito and the West.

Tito is playing his «pro-Chinese» and «anti-Soviet» card skilfully, in other words his old game of undermining communism, of undermining the Soviet revisionist

empire and strengthening the so-called «third grouping» — the grouping with American imperialism.

The Chinese comrades are guiding themselves by the illusions they nurture about the anti-Sovietism of all these revisionists, which brings no ideological or political benefit to our great cause.

It is a fact that the Soviet revisionists are being weakened through the differences they have with the other anti-Marxists, and this should be encouraged, but the blandishments of anti-Marxists must not be trusted, their promises and lies must not be believed. They are all liars and the fact is that they are quite unable to conceal their policy. A Bulgarian minister told one of our diplomats: «The Soviet Union offered China a credit of a billion dollars, but China did not accept it. It did not do well», said he, «just as you Albanians did not do well in not replying positively to Soviet proposals to carry on trade».

Anything could occur in this situation of the beginning of the softening in the Chinese stand.

We consider the sending of Chinese ambassadors to these countries a proper action on the part of China but when things reach the point that these ambassadors believe the blandishments of local revisionists and tell our ambassadors that among these leaders China is well spoken of, means to have a predisposition to listen willingly to these traitors and believe them. The danger and the evil could lie here. It is possible that these are the dispositions of ambassadors, but if such dispositions are subjective they should not be served up to us.

Our permanent task has been and is: trust and check up, be vigilant and rigorously apply the Marxist-Leninist line of our Party!

VLORA, FRIDAY
JULY 31, 1970

THE CHINESE ARE MAKING LOVE WITH THE REVISIONISTS. VIGILANCE!

The expressions of love continue openly between the Chinese and the revisionists, even in front of our comrades. This, then, is a new line that has been adopted by the Chinese leadership. Our chargé d'affaires in China informed us about the conversation which was held in his presence at an ambassadorial reception between the Bulgarian representative in Peking and the representative of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China. These two spoke to each other as sweetly as lovers and congratulated each other on the re-establishment of «fraternal» diplomatic relations. «Soon,» said the Chinese, «we shall send our ambassador to Sofia; and everything will be settled if good will exists on both sides». The Bulgarian replied to him: «Not only does the good will exist on our side, but it has always existed», etc. The conversation went on in this spirit for a long time. Up till yesterday the Chinese had the worst relations with the Bulgarians, because the Bulgarian leadership was considered by them the dirtiest and most obedient lackey of the Soviet revisionists. And this is the truth. In this case, the Chinese comrades cannot play on «the deepening of the contradictions between the Soviet and the Bulgarian revisionists», as it pleases them to justify their change. In this case, Bulgaria may serve as a bridgehead and a good example

for a more rapid rapprochement with the Soviet revisionists.

Moreover, the Chinese have begun to play a disgraceful role, that of provocateurs, and it is the people of the Chinese Security who are playing this dirty game.

The comrades inform us from Peking that at a dinner, to which a comrade of our Ministry of Internal Affairs had been invited, the deputy-foreign minister of China in the course of a speech he delivered said among other things, «when the Party of Labour of Albania, led by Enver Hoxha, first attacked the Soviet revisionists, all condemned Albania, except China, but now they recognize that Albania was right. **And among those countries and parties which acknowledge Albania was right are Rumania and Yugoslavia».**

Thus, the Chinese have assumed the shameful role of rehabilitating the traitors and trying to deceive us. This shows that they must be so deeply involved in very dubious dealings that they cannot contain themselves, but make such proposals. And to whom? To us!

Vigilance! If the Chinese leaders go on in this way and do not pull up on this descent they have started on, the course of China will be a catastrophic change. With our stands, we shall try to help them if they listen to us even a little and if these are ill-considered first steps on their part, but this I do not believe.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 11, 1970

WATCH OUT, CHINESE COMRADES, DO NOT FALL INTO THE TRAPS OF ENEMIES!

In a conversation which our ambassador in Rumania had with Emil Bodnaras, the latter dwelt on the main directions of their policy. Once again the judgement we have made is confirmed: the Rumanians are anti-Marxists, revisionists, nationalists, anti-Soviet (on a chauvinist basis) and anti-Stalinists. They are Titoites, not only because they have good relations in all fields with the Yugoslav revisionists and co-ordinate their actions with them, but also because they think in the same way ideologically. While posing as anti-Soviet, these two anti-Marxist trends are trying, with their own forms and methods, to polarize the revisionist forces (the anti-Soviet dissidents) and to bring about their supposed rehabilitation in. the world communist movement. Apparently, the Rumanians have presented this development of contradictions in the ranks of revisionism to the Chinese as «contradictions» with the Soviets and have undertaken, to the Chinese, to deepen them and «to return the mangy goats to the flock». I suspect that such a thing pleased the Chinese and they must have taken joint measures, which the Rumanians are putting into operation, as for example, the contacts with the French, Italian and other communist parties. We must watch the actions of the Chinese.

Indirectly, Bodnaras advised that «Brezhnev should

not be insulted». This, too, must have been discussed with the Chinese, because they are no longer talking about Brezhnev by name, or about Soviet social-imperialism. Meanwhile he praised Tito and Titoite Yugoslavia to the skies, and advocated the Yugoslavia-Rumania-Albania alliance, which, according to Emil Bodnaras, «will change the situation in Europe».

The Titoites are working in this direction, too. Ribichich told the Chinese ambassador in Belgrade, who passed it on to us: «We Yugoslavs have made major mistakes about Albania, we have wanted to bring down the regime by any means, but we were instigated by the Soviets (Stalin), while now we shall try to improve our relations», etc. What a «self-criticism»! It is a self-criticism intended especially for the Chinese to make them think that «the Titoites are fine fellows», that «Stalin is to blame». Bodnaras went even further, when he told our ambassador: «We owe our independence to Roosevelt and Churchill, who opposed Stalin who was against it (at Yalta)».

It is clear that the Chinese are in danger of getting caught up in the gears of a wrong and anti-Marxist machine — they are discussing problems with the Rumanian revisionists who have sold themselves to American imperialism. However, the Chinese are making a great mistake that they are not properly assessing the true nature and weight of these revisionists. These revisionists are as cowardly as they are conceited, are so stupid in their cunning that, as I have said at other times, they are convinced that they are playing and will play the *prima-donna* role in European and world politics and in the international communist movement. They pose as if they discovered China and as if their policy guides the policy of China, too.

Bodnaras spoke to our ambassador in such a haughty

tone as if the whole policy rotates around them! The so-called resistance to the Soviets, which could even be a new tactic of Tito's, American imperialism, and the Soviets, for a long-range action against China, and against Marxism-Leninism in general, is serving the Rumanian revisionists, as it served Tito and Titoism, as a trump card to raise their prestige over their «courage», «adherence to principle», etc., etc. The Rumanian revisionists will bluff on this road as much as Tito has done and is doing, but the ideological aim is that these revisionists are trying to compromise China, to set it on their course, by nurturing its weak unclear aspects, and especially to ensure that, while allegedly intending to exploit the contradictions between the Soviets and the others, the Chinese lose their bearings and violate principles. Here lies the great danger: in order to conceal their understanding and peace with the Americans, the Soviet revisionists say about them: «There is nothing they can do to us, we are a big country». The Rumanian revisionists say: «Let us go up to our necks in debt, the imperialists can do nothing to us». The Chinese might make light of their mistaken tactics in policy, but they will fall into grave errors of principle. Watch out, Chinese comrades, do not fall into the traps of enemies!

The fact is that up till now, the Chinese comrades have not informed us about the talks which they held with Bodnaras and later with the minister of defence of Rumania. This is not normal between friends. Meanwhile Bodnaras told our ambassador: «The talk with Chou En-lai and Mao was very cordial, we discussed a lot of problems and were in agreement». In some corner, in the corridors of the Foreign Ministry of China, or at the end of some excursion in a boat (so that none of our people would have time to ask questions), a third-ranking personality tells one of our comrades a few general things, and indeed just

as they are parting, says: «We also signed a secret agreement with Ionita»! All this is done in order to tell us nothing while seeming to observe rules.

The Chinese ambassador to Tirana has broken his leg, but a year has gone by without an ambassador from China, and we have no one to whom we can express our views on many problems, on which we have always spoken our minds to them openly. Perhaps the Chinese comrades like such a situation.

Among the Chinese ambassadors to the revisionist countries, we notice the tendency to speak about «the existence of contradictions in the local party and state against the Soviets». The work of Bodnaras and Tito is having its effect!

The Chinese ambassador to Belgrade up till now «has forgotten» (or has not received orders from Peking about what and how much to say) to tell our ambassador about the meeting he had with Tito, whereas he did not fail to tell him immediately what Ribichich said about us. Beautiful Bodnaras-Tito co-ordination: struggle against Stalin, «nice words» to our address. Bodnaras even told our ambassador that Tito ought to have spoken even better about Albania in Montenegro. When he returned from China, Bodnaras went to report to Tito, and they co-ordinated their activities together. We are not blind. Woe to those who do not want to see!

WEDNESDAY
DECEMBER 9, 1970

A BLAMEWORTHY ATTEMPT TO HINDER THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE FIERZA HYDRO-POWER STATION

The deputy-minister of energy of China has been here at the head of a team for about two weeks in order to look into and assist us in the matter of our hydro-power stations. Some days ago, she had two or three meetings with Comrade Rahman Hanku, who is engaged with these matters, and raised with him these problems:

1) The Fierza hydro-power station cannot be built at the place decided and where work is going on, because the terrain is unstable, because of voids which cannot be filled; new research must be done; the direction of the work must be changed; the dam cannot be built with rock and clay, as has been decided, and since the waters of the lake that will be formed will extend to Yugoslav territory, there might be unforeseen complications.

2) We will not complete the «Mao Tsetung» hydro-power plant at the date we have set; its dam is unsafe and might jeopardize the name of Mao.

Rahman Hanku categorically rejected all this as unfounded and unacceptable from our side.

She returned for a second time with the same opinions, but Rahman did not budge and demanded that her opinions should be confronted with those of the Chinese specialists who, she claimed, were in agreement with her,

while in reality they have always been in agreement with our specialists on everything.

Meanwhile, on the third occasion, she begged Rahman's pardon, saying that she had allegedly been misled by two engineers, that she herself was completely in agreement with our views on everything, that everything had been decided correctly, and many more eulogies for us.

Astonishing!! She comes from Peking, and is not sent by the two engineers with whom she justifies herself! Such an effort to hinder the construction of the Fierza hydro-power plant is to be condemned. An uncomradely, very bad way of acting. Despite our friendship, we must be vigilant.

TUESDAY
DECEMBER 22, 1970

WHAT DID KENG BIAO SAY WHEN HE LEFT TIRANA?

The Chinese Ambassador Keng Biao, who is making his farewell visits, because he is leaving Tirana and will work as director in the Foreign Directory of the CC of the CP of China, said in a conversation with the comrades of the Foreign Sector of the CC of the PLA: The Communist Party of China is no longer going to maintain contacts with the revisionists (referring to the Italian revisionist party), but through the China-Italy Friendship Association, yes.

A beautiful line! A clear Marxist-Leninist line!! According to the Chinese, we can have the revisionists as friends, we can have intercourse with them, they can praise China in articles, can praise Mao, and according to them, this is a good thing! It is clear that in such a «friendly» situation there can be no talk of either political or ideological struggle against them. The polemic is ceased. Naturally, in these ways and in these forms, the methods are found for «the creation of a joint anti-imperialist front including even the revisionists», a line very dear to the Chinese comrades which, it seems, they have been following consistently, for a long time.

The opening of doors in the field of diplomacy on

the part of China, in the way it is being done, contrary to proletarian policy, will lead to many astounding things, because the principles of its foreign policy will be vacillating and subjective. These things will cause zigzags and possibly dangerous ones.

1971

FRIDAY
JANUARY 1, 1971

THE PARTY IS BEING REORGANIZED IN CHINA

The news which reach us from Peking is good. The Communist Party of China is being reorganized according to the teachings of Mao Tsetung and the latest directives of its Congress, which was held in 1969. Also, the congress of the party for the province where Mao Tsetung was born was held late last year and it is said that this year all the other party congresses for the provinces will be held in turn. **This, naturally, presupposes that the reorganization of the party, the creation of the branches and the party committees is continuing all over China.**

Of course, the first purge of the enemy element has been carried out and it has been expelled from the party. The carrying out of the Cultural Revolution assisted in this decisive matter, but the work is not over. The struggle for the cleansing of the party ranks and the tempering of the communists must continue, and continue in new conditions and in a correct Marxist-Leninist way.

The information which is reaching us says that after the formation of the party, they will organize the trade-unions, the youth organization, and the organization of women, and this is logical. **This experience gained by the Chinese comrades, on how the party and the state socio-economic activity is being reorganized in the conditions of China after the Cultural Revolution, will be interesting.**

The Cultural Revolution in itself constitutes a major political-theoretical problem to be studied. It is now clear-

ly apparent that the enemy had penetrated deep into the party, the state, the economy, policy and culture. Mao's authority played a decisive role in the very grave and complicated conditions which had been created in China. **The fact is that Mao relied on the army, the only organized force and, possibly, uninfected by the revisionist spirit.** The masses, especially the youth, also rose in revolution, because they were called on by Mao Tsetung who led them in the «great disorder».

I have written down some thoughts about the Cultural Revolution and about other events which have occurred in China, especially since 1964. I have formulated these opinions and judgements on the basis of real events, official stands of the Chinese, etc. Frequently the information, the facts, were isolated and unconfirmed and I was obliged to make suppositions, to solve *puzzles**, as you may say. I have kept these notes and have not gone back to them again, hence I have left them just as I envisaged things at the time I wrote them. The thoughts which I am noting in this diary are, you might say, reflections which I turn over in my mind on the basis of events which occur in China, and facts which are being batted about from all aspects in large numbers of articles, both in China and throughout the world, and I am trying to find, to see the thread in this process of complicated situations. Certainly, there are things which time and events have confirmed, there are others not judged as they should have been, and also some which are not confirmed, because the situations have been very unclear.

The important thing is that a whole continent, as China is, seems to have escaped the revisionist catastrophe, that according to what is being said, the proletarian revolution has triumphed there, and we rejoice at this.

---

* English in the original.

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 17, 1971

CHEN PO-TA IS DENOUNCED AS A TRAITOR

The comrades of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China have informed us officially that «Chen Po-ta has been declared a traitor». On this matter they enumerated a series of facts which date back to 1925, and of these the main ones are: «He was a member of the Kuomintang; at that time he wrote articles against the Communist Party of China in which he described the party as easily misled in policy; he closely followed Wang Ming when he was General Secretary; when he accompanied Mao to Moscow in 1950, for three days on end, he did not inform him about what he was doing; he opposed the thesis which Mao defended, that power grows out of the barrel of the gun; he was a Trotskyist, was with Peng Teh-huai and Liu Shao-chi, edited Liu's 'famous' book and sent it to be printed in the organ of the Central Committee of the Party 'Hong qi', he was in favour of 'the working groups' and then laid the blame for them on Liu; he tried to split the cadres of the army and played one off against the other (at the time of the Cultural Revolution); he was behind the scenes in the counterrevolutionary May No. 516 organization which sought to overthrow part of the leadership, etc., etc.»

And despite all these things, he was considered «an outstanding leader», «a great theoretician», «a close comrade of Mao Tsetung and Lin Piao», «a vigilant comrade»,

«personal secretary of Mao», etc. All these descriptions applied to him are not ours, but are the words of Mao, Lin Piao, Chou En-lai and Kang Sheng, expressed to our comrades, members of the Political Bureau, when they have gone to China and have been introduced to Chen Po-ta.

On the other hand, from the start of the Cultural Revolution down to this day, Chen Po-ta was recognized officially as one of the main active leaders after Mao, indeed ahead of Kang Sheng, let alone ahead of Chou En-lai, who did not take part at all in this leading committee. Thus, suddenly, after all this glorification and these major duties, he is declared a traitor!

We ask the question: What sort of cadres policy is this? We cannot be convinced that the activity of Chen Po-ta was not known, that his open support for Wang Ming, Peng Teh-huai, Liu Shao-chi, etc., was not known. Then why was he still kept as Mao's secretary, and even worse, how is it possible that this opportunist, Trotskyist, etc., etc., was placed at the head of the Cultural Revolution, which had as its aim precisely the radical purging of such people? How is it possible that, precisely when this revolution was seething, Chen Po-ta was eulogized so greatly by the main Chinese leaders before the eyes of our comrades?

This situation is inconceivable to us. Such a policy of taking enemies, placing them at the head, praising them, and then unmasking them, is beyond understanding, however Machiavellian it may be.

Is Chen Po-ta an enemy and a traitor? This, naturally, is a question which we cannot determine. The Communist Party of China has the competence to judge this on the basis of facts and data, and their correct objective interpretation on the Marxist-Leninist dialectical road. However on the basis of what I said above, great doubts arise in our minds.

Let us suppose that this person had some secret enemy activity, and this was not known and has only just been discovered, but the truth is that his activity and close Trotskyite collaboration with enemies who were known, who were unmasked and condemned, like Wang Ming, Peng Teh-huai, Liu Shao-chi, were public, open, and known. Then, we ask again, how was this person appointed to lead the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution, and to be its main leader after Mao and Lin Piao? This is mysterious, very mysterious.

I recall what Haki reported to us, when he returned from China, in connection with Chen Po-ta, who had been appointed to accompany him on the visits which he made to different provinces of China. Cheng Po-ta behaved exceptionally well, very kindly, correctly, and showed himself to be a great well-wisher and admirer of Albania, of our Party and the Albanian people. Haki also noticed the correct criticisms of Chen Po-ta about Chinese cadres over their work, in front of Haki, he also noticed the great displeasure of Chou En-lai with Chen Po-ta, which he expressed openly when Cheng Po-ta left the meeting in the middle of Chou En-lai's speech, saying: «I don't feel well».

Now we have a better explanation for the disgraceful attitude of Li Hsien-nien towards Haki, and his generally very cold attitude to all of us, when he came to the celebration of our Liberation. Apparently he wanted to let us know that the Chinese comrades «are not in agreement with the attitude of Haki and the friendship which he showed towards Chen Po-ta». This is very perfidious. They can't hold a candle to Haki, who behaved himself properly. It is a contemptible act on their part to send a leader whom they are treating as an enemy to accompany a comrade of the Political Bureau of a sister party, and then be so shameless as to come to our coun-

try and bear a grudge against us over a matter entirely unknown to us, indeed one which apparently only Chou En-lai and Li Hsien-nien must have worked out in their own heads.

When and how will this great disorder in China come to an end — this, naturally, is very worrying to us, because China has great importance for the world proletarian revolution and for communism. Will disguised opportunism, or Marxism-Leninism triumph?

I think that under the cover of Mao Tsetung thought, powerful groups which sometimes conform, sometimes come out separately, sometimes attack and sometimes are attacked, are clashing fiercely; a struggle is being waged for power, for the consolidation of positions, over who will praise the name of Mao and proclaim his ideas more extravagantly, while on the other hand, struggling to do their own work with great mastery, to place their own men, to occupy the key positions, to become absolutely «necessary», «untouchable», and «beyond criticism».

Any objective criticism against the main faction is immediately cast as hostile work, a hostile stand «against Chairman Mao»; every gesture, every word, is analysed in this light, and the old account-books, which are complete on almost all of them, are opened up, because during all the fifty years of its existence, the Communist Party of China has gone through an unceasing factional struggle in which the cadres have been implicated and compromised, corrected, or condemned.

However, such a situation is especially worrying to our Party, because we are not among those who say «amen» to people who are not on the right road, or who do not give us complete convincing facts, full information, about those problems on which they want to convince us.

We have observed, likewise, that the Chinese lead-

ership is extremely sensitive to our reactions, which have always been and always will be prudent, dispassionate, and just. Our common interests are major ones, and we shall try to ensure that they always develop on the correct Marxist-Leninist course.

THURSDAY
APRIL 15, 1971

THE «PING-PONG POLICY»

As Chou En-lai said two days ago, China «has turned a new page» in its relations with the United States of America. It commenced this policy with its invitation to the American table-tennis team which met the Chinese team in Japan.

The American table-tennis players, together with four or five newspaper and film reporters, were invited to Peking. They went and received a «fine warm welcome», **indeed the French news agency AFP even made a comparison, saying that the reception was warmer than one that could have been given to a team from Albania, which has been and is the most loyal friend of China.** Naturally, the bourgeois news agencies are making a mountain out of a molehill, wanting to prove that «something big is going on in China». Reaction will continue to apply and propagate this tactic, because it needs it to confuse public opinion. **But the fact is that this event has the importance not of a normal sports activity, but of a new political event.**

The question of the table-tennis team is a pretext for fresh steps towards advances which the presidents of the United States of America have made in the direction of China from time to time.

The American table-tennis players were even received by Chou En-lai, a thing which must be considered an important political gesture towards the United States of

America. **Chou En-lai not only welcomed them with the traditional «warmth», without engaging in polemics, but he told them that China desires to develop friendly relations with the American people.**

Nixon, on his part, was, one might say, quick and eager to respond to Chou En-lai. He declared that he is lifting the embargo on many non-strategic goods for China and is ready to develop trade, etc. At the same time, according to news agencies, the United States of America withdrew its oil prospecting teams from the China Sea.

Thus, as can be seen, the ice is being broken. There is more to this than meets the eye. **The Foreign Ministry of China, through our ambassador in Peking, informed us about this event, while assuring us that nothing has changed or will change in the policy of China towards American imperialism, Soviet revisionism, and world reaction.**

China must come out powerfully as a colossal socialist state in the international arena and fight for the revolution, for the freedom and rights of the peoples, fight for socialism and communism. Great China must fight with all its strength against the two great imperialist superpowers, the United States of America and the Soviet Union, must smash their fiendish plans, destroy their warmongering alliances, ruin their «tranquility» and plans for hegemony which they are trying to establish throughout the world by enslaving the peoples, putting down revolutions, etc.

We have wanted China's emergence in the international arena, have supported and many times have suggested it directly to the main comrades of the Chinese leadership. **But the important thing in this action is that China must always remain red, must implement the Marxist-Leninist ideas to the letter and must not deviate from our proletarian principles and strategy.** In this case

tactics are understandable, but in our opinion, they, too, must always be principled and serve the strategy.

In their work, the Chinese comrades have the habit of sometimes going beyond the bounds which the situations and moments require, are sometimes hasty, overdo things, and then draw back. We have observed these tactics in the stand of the Chinese towards the Soviet revisionists. We hope that such tactics will not be practised in their stand towards the Americans, the British, etc., too. So, for example, in my opinion, it was not in order that Chou En-lai should immediately welcome the American tabletennis players. Someone else could have welcomed them and this thing should have been done only if some important objective had to be achieved rapidly. We do not know whether this was the aim. Let us wait and see.

Well, we understand, but many people throughout the world will not understand this step of China's so quickly, and the enemies will deliberately try to ensure a distorted understanding of it, if China does not show caution but is hasty in the implementation of tactics and does not take care that everything serves the strategy and interests of the revolution. Loss and gain are brother and sister; the two sides are struggling to make the maximum of gains without any loss.

The Americans and the Soviets, also, are striving in these directions, therefore the struggle will become fierce in somewhat new conditions and circumstances, which we must always turn to our advantage and to their defeat.

SUNDAY
MAY 23, 1971

CEAUSESCU IS TO VISIT CHINA

Ceausescu of Rumania has begun a series of receptions and meetings, without excluding anyone, without making any discrimination. He welcomes and sees off the heads of imperialism, the representatives of world banks of capitalist countries, welcomes and sees off the heads of the revisionist countries, welcomes and sees off top-level official Chinese delegations, etc. He is getting many credits from the lot of them: from the Americans, from the Federal German Republic, from France, from China, who doesn't he get them from! **Ceausescu's Rumania is being sold at auction for credits. This means «death through credits».**

And Nicolae Ceausescu, without the slightest scruple or twinge of conscience, boasts of this anti-Marxist revisionist policy, poses as a true communist, as a great man of the time, as an outstanding diplomat! He goes everywhere, from Washington to Tehran to celebrate the millenaries of the Persian Empire, to decorate the Shahanshah, the murderer of fighters and communists, and to receive a decoration from him.

Ceausescu is following Tito's road of betrayal and adventures. He is preparing to take Tito's place, harnessed to the American chariot in the international arena. Ceausescu has become so swell-headed that Tito «appears to be nothing» compared with himself. It is true, Tito is our

enemy, but the chaush remains the chaush before the bashchaush*.

However, despite this evidence, the Chinese comrades are smiling on this anti-Marxist and playing his game, while assisting him with their stand so that Ceausescu can pose as a Marxist, which he has not been, is not, and never will be.

His patrons, world capital, are greatly interested that Ceausescu, like Tito before him, should play the role of the «communist», that his country, Rumania, should be considered as if it is building socialism and as if it has contradictions with the Soviet revisionists. The Chinese are playing the latter card to justify their very friendly contacts with the Rumanians. The Chinese whisper in our ear: «We know them, they (the Rumanians) are revisionists, we know that socialism is not being built in Rumania, we are scandalized by the magnificent welcomes which are put on for De Gaulle, Nixon, the Chancellor of Bonn, etc. etc. in Rumania, but...».

In my opinion this «but» conceals and permits the Chinese comrades to make many political mistakes in their attitude towards Rumania.

In the first place, the «diploma», which Ceausescu is seeking from China to prove that he is a «communist» should not be given to him. But the Chinese comrades have given it to him and are strengthening his positions. The Chinese maintain party relations with and speak about the Communist Party of Rumania in terms which could not be more eulogistic. Now Ceausescu is to go to China, also, as the representative of the party as its First Secretary, and no doubt he will receive a magnificent welcome there with crowds, with dances, with gongs and millions of people in the streets. And then the speeches they will make!

---

* Chaush, bashchaush — respectively sergeant and sergeant major (Turkish in the original).

Ceausescu will return the compliment, will indulge in such eulogies and praise of them that the Chinese will be astounded to the point that they will say: «Where have we been that we have had some doubts about this man?!».

Of course, Ceausescu will give himself great airs in China. He is resourceful both in words and tricks. He may even be charged with «special missions»...

In any case, just his going to China will raise the communist «reputation» of this pseudo-communist in the eyes of those who want to see China under their feet. The revisionist Ceausescu gains strength to deceive, to intrigue and to fight Marxism-Leninism.

From the time Ceausescu asked to go to China, we were not opposed to it, were not in favour of his being refused permission to go, but as the representative of the Rumanian state only, and not of the party. Then, in this case, he should not have been given an extraordinary welcome, but an ordinary official welcome.

Let us come now to the question of credits which China is giving Rumania. We do not know how much it is giving, but we hear indirectly that the credits accorded are very big and, moreover, in foreign currency. It is not right for credits to be given by a socialist state to a revisionist state linked with the capitalists and imperialists, a state which is destroying the foundations of socialism and building a Titoite-capitalist economy, it is not right that credits should be given to a revisionist leadership which is reviving and strengthening the new Rumanian bourgeoisie. In our opinion, this is a grave political, ideological and economic mistake of the Chinese leadership.

The Chinese may say: «We have our own broad policy, with perspective, and in order to crystallize this we shall make some concessions, shall even make some sacrifices, but after all, it is our money we are giving, and we have given you Albanians credits, too», etc. etc. This

is their right, **but politically and ideologically it is a mistake for the anti-Marxist to be allowed to pass himself off as Marxist. It is not correct for credits to be given to Rumania so that the new parasitic Rumanian bourgeoisie can live in great affluence, when the Chinese people are struggling and making great sacrifices, and when, despite the great successes they have achieved, and the great work which they are doing, are some times short of fats, meat and even their staple food, rice.**

These things may not have an effect in China, but they have an effect in Albania, in socialist Albania, encircled by savage enemies, some of whom are revisionists who pose as communists and advertize themselves through the credits of imperialists and China, as is the case with the Rumanians, and fight our Republic which, in fact, cannot have the standard of living of the new bourgeois-revisionist stratum.

However, we shall watch Ceausescu's journey to China, shall also keep an eye on the dose of receptions and speeches of the Chinese comrades. But the stand of our press will be cold and the announcement will be made in the form of a very simple news item. Let the Chinese understand our attitude towards the Rumanian revisionists, whose copper we have no intention of «gilding».

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 2, 1971

THE CHINESE AND CEAUSESCU

Ceausescu went to China at the head of a delegation of... 80 people. Not even the cook was missing!

He was given a big reception at the airport and in the streets, where more than half a million people had come out to cheer him. Apart from Chou En-lai and other important cadres of the Chinese party and state there was also Lin Piao's wife who had been sent to the airport by her husband, while Mao's wife welcomed «the notable guests» at «the reception residence». As can be seen, the welcome was complete: even the biggest two were represented by their wives at the welcome for «the great man of Rumania».

Chou En-lai made a pompous speech of exceptional warmth, filled with such expressions as «the Rumanian people have fought heroically», «they liberated themselves», «the Communist Party of Rumania is an heroic revolutionary party», «socialist Rumania is fighting heroically against imperialism», «the Communist Party of Rumania and Ceausescu are fighting for the greatness of socialist Rumania», «the Chinese people are inspired by them», «the Chinese people will assist them to the end», and many other expressions like these.

Whom are they eulogizing? A dyed-in-the-wool revisionist, a Titoite, a pro-American, who welcomed Nixon with such great acclamation and who is allegedly in con-

tradiction with the Soviets today, but who will be embracing them tomorrow because he is an unprincipled reactionary.

In fact, in his reply to Chou En-lai's speech, Ceausescu put forward his revisionist line with the greatest self-confidence and aplomb. **He did not say one word about the Cultural Revolution, as if nothing had occurred, did not mention one word against American imperialism, but expressed himself «for the unity of the socialist countries and the international communist movement».**

Finding himself embarrassed, the Deputy Foreign Minister of China, who was at a table with our ambassador, who remained cold and did not applaud, said to our ambassador: «We have continually advised Comrade Ceausescu that he should not present these things like this, because he presents them in a wrong way». Our ambassador replied: «You waste your time advising him, he could not put matters differently because he is a determined revisionist». «That is so», said the Chinese to him.

Mao received Ceausescu. Hsinhua reported only that he said to him: «Rumanian comrades, we should unite to bring down imperialism». As if Ceausescu and company are to bring down imperialism!! If the world waits for the Ceausescus to do such a thing, imperialism will live for tens of thousands of years. It is the proletariat and the peoples that fight imperialism.

Nevertheless, Ceausescu is going about his business, pursuing and defending his revisionist line, continuing his tour of China amidst the cheering, and will certainly get fat credits «in order to build socialism». From China he will go on to his friend, Kim Il Sung. After Korea he is to go to Vietnam, and then to Mongolia, where Tsedenbal, «set up» by Brezhnev like those Mongolian puppets, awaits him, and from there it will not be surprising if he goes to

Moscow allegedly since his road takes him that way, but making concessions to and receiving concessions from the Soviets, with whom he «is in contradiction», as he himself so loudly proclaims. Certainly, Ceausescu will inform Brezhnev about the results achieved in China, without failing to boast of his own role, and will tell him about his impressions of China and the great «hopes» he is nurturing.

The tone of Ceausescu's official speech and especially when he says, **«We must unite in struggle against imperialism, the unity of the socialist countries must be strengthened», makes one suspect that he has gone to Peking charged with a special mission by the Soviets. This mission must comprise the cessation of the polemic with the Soviets and ideological conciliation with them.**

If the Chinese comrades accept such a thing, it will be a slide into open revisionism, **but I have hopes that Mao will not accept it. As for some of the others, they find the ways to accept it.**

This is the line which Liu Chao-chi and Teng Hsiao-ping advocated at the time when the attack of the Soviet revisionists on our Party and our attack against them had reached its culmination and raging furiously. Since that time we told the Chinese, «We do not proceed on this course, you may take it if you like, but it will be a fatal course for you». They did what they did, withdrew from this course and no longer mentioned it, and the fire of the battle against the Soviet revisionists was increased. Now the Rumanian «politician» has come out to propose that we join him in the cesspool of betrayal in which he himself is wallowing. If he wants to avoid trouble for himself, to avoid picking a fight with us, let him remain where he is, together with others of his ilk, the revisionists of Moscow, Belgrade, and wherever they may be.

Knowing some of the weaknesses in line of the Chinese

comrades, Ceausescu, Tito, and their patrons are directing their strategy to create the impression in the world, through various tactics, that a bloc (which is not a bloc) with certain definite principles has been created around China, and implying that since China is with Rumania, Yugoslavia, North Korea, and North Vietnam, Albania is, too. To this so-called grouping, which they are attempting to create, they are gradually giving the colour of a Marxist-Leninist communist grouping, with party relations between one another, which are developing with some internal contradictions, but unimportant ones.

We must unmask and destroy this anti-Marxist and pro-imperialist strategy and tactics. The Chinese comrades must not be deceived and fall into these traps, **and we must not allow it to appear as if we, too, are involved in the manoeuvres which the revisionists are up to with the Chinese, or that we approve them. We must maintain our independent stand on every issue that presents danger so that world opinion understands that we do not enter into combinations with the revisionists, but have our independent Marxist-Leninist policy and stand.**

Many of these things, which we think are important issues of line, we must discuss openly, as comrades, with the Chinese. We shall be frank and sincere with them always, because we do not want any shadow to be cast over our Marxist-Leninist unity. We shall tell the Chinese comrades our comradely criticism whenever it is necessary, whether they like it or not. We think that when things are stated openly by each side, in the interest of Marxism-Leninism and the common line, they are positive, and Marxist-Leninists cannot but reflect on them; even when there are differences of view, time and the dialectical revolutionary development of events prove the correctness of any thesis, whether or not any stand is correct.

MONDAY
JUNE 7, 1971

AFTER CEAUSESCU THE CHINESE ARE EXPECTING THE YUGOSLAV TEPAVAC

Ceausescu is coming to the end of his trip to China. The Foreign Minister of Yugoslavia, Tepavac, will begin his trip tomorrow, or the day after. Synchronized journeys. The one is not allowing the egg the other laid to get cold. They are comrades, friends, revisionist allies, the pair of them. The two, both the Rumanian and the Yugoslav, pose as communists, Marxist-Leninists, «rabidly» anti-Soviet and equally «rabidly» anti-imperialist.

The former, Ceausescu, poses as having the «diploma» of a Marxist and wants to reinforce it by seeking the seal of Mao. The other, the Yugoslav, has a torn and soiled «diploma», but wants to stick it together and clean off the stain, again with the seal of Mao. That's the seal they seek and, naturally, these two «gentlemen» with high pretentions, have co-ordinated their actions, tactics, and strategy.

China is welcoming them, or at least the Rumanian, as we already know, with flowers, with adulation, with gongs and crowds of people. This is the facade. We shall see what sort of welcome the Yugoslav will receive. I believe (but nothing is known) that Tepavac will not be welcomed by the people, but he will certainly be welcomed by Chou En-lai, chief of diplomacy and of everything Chinese, indeed with no loss of time. The Yugoslav, Tepavac will

manoeuvre so beautifully, will tell them things «so believable, so interesting, so politically in order» that I believe that even Mao's door will be opened to him, and undoubtedly Tepavac will give him some message of comradely and friendly greetings from Tito.

The ice has been broken under the pretext of anti-Sovietism. Later Tito and Yovanka or Chou En-lai might make a visit to each other's countries, «of course» each maintaining the opinions on questions over which they are divided, but collaborating on those which unite them.

Under the mask of anti-Sovietism, the master Tito, and his young apprentice with big aspirations, Ceausescu, will manoeuvre for the rapprochement with the United States of America where they have their heads and their feeding trough. Woe betide those who fall into their trap!

Even the smell of the food is delightful to the hungry. The Titoites have bagsfull of information, prepared in the special kitchens of Western espionage and served up at a high level. As refined diplomats, they can easily wriggle through the eye of the needle, even as «Marxists», if vigilance towards them is not kept sharp. They are confidence tricksters, trained to clap the handcuffs on the others, while praising a great state or a small state. It is all the same to them, they are ready to «acknowledge» the mistakes made towards others, without acknowledging anything, until they have you by the throat.

Ceausescu made propaganda about the fact that on his way to China he would not pass through Moscow. Once he was certain he would go to Peking, he declared that he would visit Mongolia, the Soviet colony. The Rumanian ambassadors in Europe are preparing the ground for Ceausescu to pass through Moscow, this time in order to affirm his «neutrality» and his work done in China for «the unity of the socialist countries».

What else Ceausescu will take to Moscow we do not

know, but certainly he will take such assurances as «the Chinese comrades are purging their line of excesses», etc., etc. Hence, what the Chinese comrades tell us, they also tell their friend and comrade, Ceausescu, in more detail.

Certainly Ceausescu will advise the Soviets to be patient, not to aggravate matters, because they and the Titoites are at work. The revisionists will continue to work at their trade and to be paid by the clients for whom they perform special services.

Nicolae Ceausescu is no different from Tito, whose place he hopes to take and whose role he hopes to play, and hence, after every act of treachery or deal, to receive his check in dollars or roubles. All the things I say here have been confirmed and time will confirm them again in the future.

TUESDAY
JUNE 8, 1971

CHEN PO-TA IS ACCUSED OF ALL THE SINS

Keng Biao, former Ambassador of China to our country, and now Director of the Foreign Directory at the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, told our ambassador in China, approximately the following: We are very busy because we are purging the line of the distortions and grave errors which Chen Po-ta has made.

What are these errors which Chen Po-ta has made? The development of the cult of Mao, the singing of praise to Mao; the covering of walls with quotations and portraits; the inflated propaganda without content; the study of theory with no profound basis; the hiding of shortcomings; the tendency to place China first in everything, etc., etc.

It is very good that they are correcting the shortcomings and mistakes in line. This is positive. But again the question arises: Is it only «the crook Chen Po-ta», who has done all these things? They know best whether or not Chen Po-ta was a crook. But where were the others? Why did they permit these «mistakes in line»? And at what period did they permit them? Precisely when the group of Liu Shao-chi was being fought and when their vigilance about the purity of the line should have been very keen!

Was it only Chen Po-ta who created and put into practice the covering of walls with quotations and por-

traits, the superficial study of the ideas of Mao Tsetung in the forms and methods which were used, and the singing of praise (which Chou En-lai himself orchestrated and conducted)? In this way he turns out to be an «amazing dictator», who takes no notice of anyone, who asks no one, who acts the way he knows, just as he likes. But what were the others doing? Sleeping? Do they not deserve to be criticized, at least for this alone? They sleep once, they sleep twice, who can guarantee that they will not go to sleep for a third time?!

All those things which we have said on these questions and on which we have given our judgements from the external facts, are being confirmed. However, during the time of the Cultural Revolution, we have said that certain matters, even though they have been outside the norms of a Marxist-Leninist party, could have been done *a la rigueur**, for example, it was necessary to build up the authority of Mao in those circumstances in order to triumph over the gang of Liu Shao-chi, etc.

However, the Chinese comrades now tell us that this purification of the line is being done «to serve the emergence of China in the international arena», «to be in order with foreign friends, etc.». If it is being done for these reasons, it is still not on a principled basis, it is an expedient and smells of opportunism.

Will the Marxist-Leninist principles be safeguarded in the line, strategy and current tactics which the Communist Party of China and the Chinese Government are adopting? Will these softenings and the progressive extension of relations à la Chou En-lai be kept within the bounds of a line, rigid in principle and flexible in action, or will the flexibility predominate over principles, until it distorts them and in the end another Chen Po-ta is discovered on whom to throw all the blame, and some

* Compelled by necessity (French in the original).

other Chen Po-ta triumphs, and those who defended the opposite line and principles become Chen Po-tas?

If the road which pleases foreigners is followed, we know what they want; we know also that this road is not opened all at once, but it is prepared, applied progressively, propagated, «given a veneer» of the Marxist-Leninist theory and Mao Tsetung thought, while the internal propaganda and «foreign friends» bring out «clearly» «the benefits, successes, the international fame», which «this very wise and skilful Marxist-Leninist line» has brought.

Thus Ceausescu set the ball rolling by going officially to China, and although he did not speak about the Great Cultural Revolution at all, he was welcomed with very great honours, was given large amounts of aid and described as a «Marxist-Leninist». The Yugoslav Tepavac is following Ceausescu. The Yugoslav Titoites are masters of intrigue. They see that the Chinese iron is hot and are hastening to strike it before it cools.

The Chinese have told us that they have decided to allow American senators, businessmen, journalists, sociologists, etc., into China. The Soviets began in this way, too.

Let us hope nothing comes of it!

SATURDAY
JUNE 12, 1971

THE TITOITE FOREIGN MINISTER IS WELCOMED TO CHINA

Tepavac is visiting China on the invitation of the Chinese Government. He was welcomed at Shanghai airport by crowds, flags and the main authorities of the city. At Peking airport, the welcome was warmer. Over five thousand people had turned out with flowers, flags and gongs. Li Hsien-nien, with his usual suite, was there to meet him.

The Yugoslav was pleased with the welcome. The Titoite press is saying thi3. The Chinese are very pleased, too. Li Hsien-nien expressed this in his speech at the banquet he put on. The articles in «Renmin Ribao», which, for several days has devoted up to a whole page to this problem, also say this.

So far they have not said a single word to our ambassador in Peking. We are judging simply from the speeches of Li Hsien-nien and Tepavac.

Li Hsien-nien addressed the Yugoslav in a very warm, very friendly tone, did not mention party or ideological questions, or questions on which they are not «in agreement»; as far as I could see, he did not say that socialism is being built in Yugoslavia, but he implied such a thing, while he spoke about everything else and concluded his speech by proposing a toast to the health of Tito. Li Hsien-nien lauded the Yugoslav revisionists in an extravagant

way, but at the same time, with servility (with the obvious aim of rapprochement and conciliation).

Apart from his high assessment of the heroism of the peoples of Yugoslavia during the Second World War, a thing which is real and proper to say, **Li Hsien-nien, (without mentioning names) also eulogized the current struggle which the Yugoslavs are allegedly waging against imperialism!!, their struggle and resistance against a great power, which in recent times (?!) has been interfering in the affairs of Yugoslavia. (The «great power» means the present-day Soviet Union, but it could also mean it in the time of Stalin).**

Li Hsien-nien praised Tito's policy «in the third world», and the great role of the Yugoslav Titoites in this direction. He expressed thanks for the continual aid which Yugoslavia has given China in the United Nations Organization, pointing out the «correct» stands of the Titoites towards Vietnam, Cambodia, the Arab countries, and so many other words like these, and concluded by saying that they would collaborate, would coexist, would help each other, and so many fine and beautiful words, as if nothing at all had occurred between Marxist-Leninists and the Titoites.

Meanwhile Tepavac's speech was full of nuances, delivered with confidence in what he said, a diplomat's speech, warm, and at the same time, cold like the blood of the snake. The Titoite put forward his line, carefully dotting the i's. He said the usual things praising the Chinese (the Long March, Chinese patience), but did not fail to say, «we do not know each other well», «we Yugoslavs are not against great powers, but against their dictate», «we look with concern at the situation in the world», «we are building socialism in Yugoslavia», **«we are for European security», a thing which Li Hsien-nien approved in his speech, etc., etc.** There was no lack of proposals for

friendly collaboration in all fields, and the Titoite finished off his «bouquet» with toasts, amongst which four were individual toasts: one for Mao, one for Lin Piao, one for Chou En-lai, and finally one for Li Hsien-nien (the four people who run China). Assuredly, the Chinese were very flattered.

Later, Tepavac made some visits here and there, to some factory, to the Great Wall, to the Ming Tombs, and ate with chop-sticks according to the traditional Chinese custom. The Chinese publicized all this. Finally, Chou En-lai received him at a friendly audience. As to what was said, what was discussed, nothing has come out. They are telling our ambassador nothing about the conclusion of the talks, either with Ceausescu or Tepavac. Well, we are waiting, we are patient.

However, one tendency is clear. The Rumanians, on the one hand, under the mask of communists and with party relationships, and the Yugoslavs, on the other hand, under the mask of communists, but whom the Chinese still «do not recognize as such and with whom they do not have party relations», are making efforts, and they are achieving their aim, to bring about a rapprochement with China, to show themselves as and become its best friends in the world. (With the exception that, for the time being, they, and possibly the Chinese, too, think that Albania has to be overcome either by entering into their combinations or by remaining as something unimportant and an anachronism.) This is the trend, this the tune China is piping, too.

At present China considers Albania and the Party of Labour of Albania its «first friend and comrade», Vietnam and Korea in second place, and in third place Rumania and Yugoslavia, and here its star begins to rise in Europe. In the friendship with these pro-American, pseudo-communists of revisionist Europe, the anti-Soviet

tendency predominates. The Chinese are relying precisely on anti-Sovietism for the development of their friendship with these two countries, allegedly on a state platform, but with a very much softened ideological platform. Rumania and Yugoslavia, likewise, are taking advantage of the Soviet-Chinese contradictions to diminish their own contradictions with the Soviets.

Both sides want to take advantage of the situations which they have created and which they are boosting. **The two European mendicant monks strengthen their positions vis-à-vis the Americans and other capitalist states, as well as in the «third world», by showing them that they are friends of a colossal power which is rising and without which no progress is possible.** It is self-evident that the Yugoslav and Rumanian revisionists are co-authors of something big which is being prepared.

While China, on the other hand, and I think that it is making a mistake and the reckoning is not in its favour, wants to rely on two international political *forbans** **who will not help matters, but will foul you by association with them. We shall be witnesses of such an abnormal development for China. The forms cannot conceal the content for long.**

There may be all sorts of talk about coexistence, indeed this may be described in capital letters as «Leninist», but the problem is its content. It must really be Leninist, otherwise that coexistence goes all to hell. We shall see! We shall see! May we be wrong! We are ready to make self-criticism if none of these things we envisage turns out so. **But the people say: «You do not need a guide to the village in sight».**

---

* Buccaneers (Fr. in the original).

TUESDAY
JUNE 22, 1971

THE CHINESE COMRADES «INFORM» US ABOUT THE TALKS WITH CEAUSESCU

They call it information! This came from a person ranking fourth or fifth in the Foreign Directory of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, and not from Keng Biao, as he himself had promised our ambassador, but did not do, allegedly because he was busy!

The information was full of general things about arrivals and departures, those things which Hsinhua has given and have been published in the newspapers, quotations from the public speeches of Li Hsien-nien and Ceausescu.

Then he went on to say that Ceausescu had gone to China to strengthen his position and that of Rumania in the world, to seek economic aid from the Chinese, «because Rumania was in difficulties», and the Chinese gave it 60 million dollars in hard currency and goods.

Ceausescu proposed to the Chinese that they should cease the polemic against «the Communist Party of the Soviet Union and the other parties of the socialist countries», that they should join Comecon and take part in international organizations such as the World Federation of Trade Unions etc., and improve their relations with other revisionist parties of the world for the sake of the unity of the international communist movement.

Finally, as a conclusion, the Chinese told our ambas-

sador that the talks ended successfully, that «the struggle against American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism» was strengthened. Ceausescu spoke well in this regard about China, about the construction of industry and, as the Chinese put it, he said: **«The Rumanian press is writing about these things and we have begun to educate the Rumanian people».**

«Everything went fine with Ceausescu», the Chinese told our ambassador, «but we also had contradictions with him. We did not agree that we should stop the polemic with the Soviets, even after eight thousand years; **we do not unite with them in the struggle against imperialism; we do not join the international organizations, and we shall fight the revisionists from outside these organizations, and not by taking part in them.»**

These were the points on which they were opposed. On all other things, the talks went without a hitch. Ceausescu assured the Chinese that the Soviets were not going to attack them and that there was no further danger of a second Czechoslovakia. As can be seen, Ceausescu of Rumania brought the Chinese «every blessing».

What is the effect of all these things the Chinese whisper into our ear? On many questions Ceausescu imposed his pace on them. He did not allow the Chinese to attack the Soviet revisionists, was careful to ensure that neither the communiques nor the speeches implied that the Soviet Union was molesting the Rumanians, but proposed and was ready to help China open its arms to the Soviet revisionists. Ceausescu did not want to alter anything of his revisionist formulations. His aim of bringing the Chinese as close as possible to his views was clear.

Ceausescu tried to get endorsement of his views on how many countries were socialist, but the Chinese did not fall into this trap.

But can it be said that the Chinese understood who Ceausescu is? If they understood this, then why all that welcome, all that pomp and praise on their part?

Ceausescu even wanted to eliminate the term «the Marxist-Leninist parties», when the communique mentioned the two parties, and to substitute «sister parties» for it. The implication and his objective are clear. The Chinese, naturally, «took Ceausescu to the cleaners», insisting that the term «Marxist-Leninist party» be used. And in this way the Communist Party of Rumania received the seal from the Chinese that it is a «Marxist-Leninist party», whereas it is a revisionist party from top to bottom.

What emerges from all this? It is clear that state relations prevailed over the ideological line of the Communist Party of China. The latter, the ideological line, was subordinated to the former. Many basic principles of ideology and line were violated, distorted, or overshadowed. These three things did not come about accidentally, but through complete ideological conviction. The equivocal phrases which they whisper «in our ear» that «in going through talks and the visit we learn who they are» (!), are of no importance. They were very slow to recognize them!! Have they not had time to recognize them before?! They have had all the time they needed and plenty of deeds, which proved what Ceausescu and company were. But what importance has a whispered word, when the official stands say the opposite, when the decisions and actions of political, ideological, economic, and even military collaboration tell a different story? We are convinced that later events will prove us right. We look at everything from the political and ideological angle, do not confound state relations with party relations, but even state relations do not stand outside the sphere of the policy and ideology of the party, therefore in this direction, too, we take great care not to go beyond the bounds. The enemies make many efforts

and use a thousand tricks to set you on the road of degeneration of the Marxist-Leninist line. It requires maturity, conviction, determination, and ideological formation in Marxism-Leninism to avoid slipping on the road of the enemy. If you have these qualities, you can go ahead without being sectarian or opportunist, you won't move towards isolation or slip into revisionism and into the lap of capitalism.

DURRËS, SATURDAY
JULY 24, 1971

THE WELCOMING OF NIXON TO CHINA IS A MAJOR OPPORTUNIST MISTAKE

Nixon is to go to Peking. We are not in agreement, therefore I think we should write the Chinese a letter. These are what should be the main theses:

Thanks for the information which Comrade Chou En-lai gave our ambassador in Peking, who came specially to Tirana and reported to us what had been communicated to him (possibly, in the introduction a very concise summary should be made, using the authentic expressions of Chou, of those problems which we are going to raise, or contest, but all this must have a logical order. With this we tell the Chinese comrades that our reply is based on Chou's information).

We shall give them a hard-hitting exposition in which it must be shown that our two parties, two governments and two peoples **have fought on one line at the head of the front against American imperialism, Soviet revisionist imperialism and world reaction**, and have scored successes, etc., etc. These enemies have attacked our countries, our parties, and Marxism-Leninism, but have failed, have been exposed, and our unity has grown stronger.

We shall speak about the major role of China in the international arena, how others have fought it, and how we have defended it.

We shall speak about the Cultural Revolution, about

the enemies' hopes and the triumph of this revolution in China.

With the advance of the Cultural Revolution and the alteration of the balance of forces the enemies begin to «smile on China», false friends pose as its sincere friends, the revisionist traitors, long in the service of American imperialism, and temporarily in divergency with the Soviet revisionists, pose as friends of China, enemies of the Soviets, enemies of the United States of America, and resolute friends of «the third world». They all speak about peaceful coexistence; many states recognize China and Albania. We ought to respond in a favourable manner to those advantageous circumstances created not from the desire of our enemies, but by our resolute struggle, wherever the opportunity presented itself, **while always safeguarding the principles and dignity of our socialist states.**

We have been and are for China to come out in the international arena as a great and powerful socialist state and together with it, all of us, all the peoples of the world to have our say, impose our will and destroy the fiendish, warmongering, colonialist, enslaving plans of the Soviet, American and other big imperialist powers.

We think that co-ordination of our common struggle is necessary, especially when it is a matter of a «major strategy». Hence, they must understand clearly that we have not been, are not and never will be for the stand that great China should not talk with whom it likes, and establish diplomatic relations with whom it likes, even with American imperialism. **But, when it comes to the matter of alteration of a tactic, let alone of the strategy, towards American imperialism, we think that consultations are necessary between close friends in order to weigh up both the minuses and the pluses of the step which is to be taken, when this step has a major international effect and repercussions.**

To receive President Nixon and talk with him, without having diplomatic relations with the United States of America, but on the contrary, having a state of hostility between the two states, and above all, knowing that he is the number one enemy of the peoples, **is not correct and will not be accepted by the peoples, the revolutionaries and the genuine communists. We are among those who do not accept this decision and will not support it.**

We shall express the belief that the Chinese comrades will not give way on principles, that they will fight as they should against American imperialism, and that **this logical, Marxist-Leninist stand will immediately come into flagrant opposition to the decision which they have taken, which we shall describe as hasty.**

We must stress to them that the enemies, American imperialism, Soviet revisionism, Titoism, the Rumanian revisionists and all world reaction, are in unison in order to discredit the policy of China. **We must not forget that the touchstone and that which distinguishes us from the enemies is the stern and uncompromising, blow for blow struggle, in the first place, with American imperialism and with Soviet social-imperialism.**

It seems to us that the continuation of talks with the Americans about problems which are important to the People's Republic of China and about world problems, **has importance in certain given conditions and precisely: when they are in the interest of China and the cause of the revolution in general; when these talks are held in conditions at least of equality, especially for China; when the United States of America has recognized the People's Republic of China as the only lawful government of the Chinese people, when it has withdrawn its troops from Taiwan, etc., and when the interests of the peoples, the revolution and Marxism-Leninism are not infringed by**

these talks. In these conditions we are not against talks and understand that in order to reach this point, the talks may be upgraded, naturally, with great care, **but we are not in agreement that such upgrading should go from «contacts without any value» in one leap to the meeting of top personalities of the two states, China and the United States of America, because Nixon has allegedly expressed the desire many times!** In our opinion, this can no longer be called «a simple upgrading of talks» but a very complicated upgrading, with consequences.

We have not heard anything about «Nixon's ardent desire, for three years on end, to go to China», but we take your word for it. **The desires of this fascist president to go to China can be understood, they are the desires of an aggressor, a murderer of peoples, an enemy of communism, of socialism, especially of China, who has occupied Taiwan and hatched up plots together with the Soviet revisionists against China. He is especially an enemy of Albania, which the United States of America has never wanted to recognize as a people's democratic government and against which has hatched up a thousand plots with the Titoites, the Greek monarcho-fascists, the Italian neo-fascists, and the Soviet revisionist social-imperialists.** Therefore, for our part, it has never crossed our minds to take any notice of «these desires» of this hangman, whose purpose was to discredit the People's Republic of China, to detach it from its friends, to enable him (Nixon) to come out waving the olive branch, at a time when terrible quantities of bombs were being dropped on Vietnam and elsewhere. But we have proceeded from the idea that the People's Republic of China, like Albania, stood solid as a granite rock and exposed and fought this hangman.

You (the Chinese) describe the failure on the part of Chinese diplomats to fulfil Nixon's desires to go to China

in these conditions (which are now revealed to us in the report) as an «ultra-left action» of your Ministry of Foreign Affairs. This is your right, but since you saw fit to inform us of this fact, we are expressing to you our opinion that Nixon's desires should not have been fulfilled.

It is said that «the Warsaw talks were open and known to the whole world». It might have been so for the whole world, but not for us, for Albania, the loyal ally of China, which has never been informed about these talks at any time, except now.

Likewise, we are hearing now, for the first time, that at Warsaw China had agreed that the United States of America should send special top level functionaries to China to prepare for the coming of the President, at a time when the war and the American attacks were continuing furiously, one after the other, on the peoples of Indochina. We consider this very wrong in principle, strategy and tactics.

We think that the visit of the table-tennis team is no accident. The visit of the table-tennis team was not for the purpose of establishing «links with the American people» but, on the contrary, was a pretext to re-establish the broken-off relations and to put into practice the agreements reached.

The considerations and conclusions about the situation in the United States of America have been absolutized and treated unrealistically, with the intention that they should serve to explain the political step which is being taken: «The American people do not like the war», «the people are holding demonstrations», «there is fighting in the streets, and four students have been killed»,

«decorations are being thrown into the park around the White House», «the American people are not against the regime, but against Nixon». And this Nixon whom the American people «hate», is summoned to Peking!

Eisenhower in Japan, Johnson and Nixon wherever they have gone (with the exception of Yugoslavia and Rumania where they are welcomed with flowers) have been received with tomatoes, rotten eggs and demonstrations.

Our assessment is that, **the revolution is mounting, the peoples are struggling for freedom, American imperialism is being weakened, and not it alone, but the whole capitalist system, is experiencing a grave crisis**, and this is taking place outside their control, regardless of their predatory and blood-thirsty wars. **However the tableau which Comrade Chou En-lai presents to us, citing a series of completely true facts, cannot confirm the conclusion that «American imperialism is utterly exhausted and only a puff of wind is needed to bring it down», even though he quotes Nixon himself to us.**

We must neither overrate nor underrate the enemy. It is true that in the United States of America there are protests and demonstrations against the war in Vietnam, but these are still sporadic and **we cannot say that «the United States of America is experiencing a great revolutionary storm». We do not evaluate this thing so. From their economic situation, from the ideology which inspires them, from their way of life, customs, traditions, contacts, etc., the American people are far from being in a revolutionary position. A great deal of water will pass under the bridges over the rivers of America before that time arrives. We are convinced that time will certainly come, but this requires a great deal of work, a major struggle. We must not create illusions.**

The theory of contacts with the people.

«We carry on the diplomacy of the people,» they say, but in fact they implement the diplomacy of chiefs. Here we should develop our example with the Yugoslavs.

By analogy the Chinese ought to act with the Americans and the Soviets alike. Hence Brezhnev should go to Peking.

We must develop our stand towards the Soviet revisionists.

No trust should be put in the words of American imperialism. «The American army will rot», «Nixon is going because he does not want to continue the war» (that means American imperialism no longer likes wars!!), «Nixon will soften up China» (yes, in order to weaken it and to incite it against the Soviet revisionists with which the United States of America must also have contradictions).

The theory of war and peace.

We do not believe that the United States of America will withdraw the troops and dismantle the bases which it has in the world without being forced to do so by war. The example of Libya does not prove much. If the United States of America thinks that its puppets themselves are to fight the peoples who rise, while America assists them with money, this means that the United States of America must sign its own death warrant and that of its puppets. We must have no illusion that such a thing will occur through America's own desire. With-

drawal from one country following defeat does not mean non-intervention in another country.

The talks on the war in Vietnam are in order only if they have been held following consultation with the Vietnamese and on a correct and principled basis. We have determined our line on the war in Vietnam and we are defining it again for them to see.

Our policy on Taiwan must be reconfirmed.

The problem of Japan.
The problem of Korea.
The question of India.

What did Kissinger say?

It would have been more correct if we had had prior discussions about this «great strategic plan», because in fact, here we have to do with a new strategic plan, direct, top-level talks between China and the United States of America in special conditions.

The line of our Party will remain unaltered.

As a conclusion, the Chinese have made a major opportunist mistake, have shown themselves to be rightists and their action is revisionist and to be condemned. In no way should they have agreed that Nixon should go to Peking. With this political act they confuse the world revolutionary movement and damp down the revolutionary impetus, extinguish this impetus and assist in the incitement of the worst pacifist sentiments. They gravely damage the new Marxist-Leninist parties which have looked upon China and Mao Tsetung as the pillar of the revolution and defenders of Marxism-Leninism.

The modern revisionists are highly pleased by what China has done, because this action brings grist to their mill. They will exploit this thing to the maximum, and with great demagogy will erode that positive capital that China had built up. **They will manoeuvre to make China sink more deeply into the mire of revisionism and into friendship with the Americans, and will raise the anti-Sovietism of the great Chinese state to a theory.**

Imperialism and world capitalism benefit from this action of China. With what it has done China has helped the fascist Nixon, given him great possibilities of triumphing again in the presidential elections, has brought about that he can pose as a «president of peace, a great president». With this Nixon gains the role of «arbiter» between the Soviet Union and the People's Republic of China. Both of them allegedly seek the friendship of the American people, but settle things and reach agreements with the presidents. The two sides pretend that by reaching agreement with the presidents they are making contact with the American people and «in this way, are rocking the throne of American imperialism». All this means to throw dust in the eyes of the public, because there is no need for Nixon or any other president to go to Peking so that the American people will be influenced by China. Struggle and ideas recognize no borders.

It is true that the «throne» of American imperialism «must be shaken within», but it is equally true, if not more so, that it must be shaken and overthrown outside, too. The power of American imperialism is based not only within the United States of America, but also abroad, and its weakest point is abroad. American imperialism is exploiting the peoples of the world and supports this exploitation with force, with armies, with bases, with plots, which

it is not reducing, as Chou says, but on the contrary, will increase them. This is where it should be hit hardest. We must not weaken this front in any way. If the United States of America loses here, its empire is finished, like that of Britain, and only then can we envisage grave crises within the United States of America.

DURRËS, MONDAY
JULY 26, 1971

GLARING REVISIONISM

The Sino-American honeymoon has begun. The match-makers have finally had their penultimate meeting to prepare the great wedding, the Mao-Nixon meeting.

«The long and cordial talks amongst the old friends», Mao Tsetung, Chou En-lai and Edgar Snow, ended with success like the arias at the start of «Madam Butterfly». Nixon learned their content (because that was the aim for which they were held), American reaction learned of it, Wall Street learned of it, without doubt the allies of the United States of America, and in the first place, the Soviets certainly learned of it, but the Chinese have kept it and are still keeping it a secret from the Albanians, «the loyal allies of China».

We ask a simple question: Why? What secrets are there in these talks that we must not become acquainted with their content? The answer is simple: The talks have not been held on the Marxist-Leninist line, therefore the Chinese comrades are afraid to make them known to us.

Of course, they have discussed every aspect of their strategy and tactic with Edgar Snow. Edgar Snow has certainly bought a great deal and sold nothing. He has assessed the situation as very favourable for American imperialism and succeeded in arranging «the match»

which, to the regret of Chou En-lai, had been made difficult for three years on end by the armed attacks on Vietnam and in the whole of Indochina (as Chou himself says).

To talk to an envoy of American imperialism, who poses as a friend of China, to be certain that what you tell him he will rush off to carry «fresh» to the heads of imperialism — and the talks were held precisely for this; and on the other hand, to fail to inform your own friend and ally, Albania, first of all, and then the whole of world opinion, **this is perfidy, this is glaring revisionism, this is not «people's diplomacy», as the Chinese claim, but is secret diplomacy with the heads of American imperialism.**

Khrushchev did many base things, openly and under cover, but he publicized his meetings. The meeting of Chou En-lai with Kissinger had to take the course it did, because this is how it began, in great secrecy, but when it ended «with success» and the world was given the «glad tidings», the Chinese had no way to hide it from us.

Irrespective of the great shame, which they never felt, because secret negotiations have been going on for a long time, irrespective that only when it became a *fait accompli* they told us of it, **the information of Chou En-lai which was given to us shows their revisionist opportunist line, shows their lack of logic and argument, shows their desire for rapprochement with the Americans, and their lame attempts to conceal this desire. This information brings up weak arguments in order to forestall correct principled criticisms which will be made and, finally, all their arguments are based on an incorrect, very weak political analysis, supported with false reasoning to justify this shitty thing they did.**

Let us take the question of the famous «analysis of

the international situation» which Chou makes. His trust in the United States of America is quite obvious here. He has faith in reasons which do not hold water, which are pacifist, revisionist, anti-revolutionary and anti-Marxist, believes that the American armies and bases will be withdrawn from Indochina, from the Far East in general, from Taiwan. According to Chou's exposition, it turns out that Japanese militarism is becoming a threat and will seek expansion; therefore Chou asked the United States of America not to permit such a thing, and it «accepted» this request. It emerges from the talks that an «alliance or friendship» between China and the United States of America is being sought in order to restrain Japan which is becoming dangerous. But there is also the question of the Soviet Union. What was said about it? According to Chou, the Chinese said nothing at all, while Kissinger spoke at length. But what did he say? For us Albanians this is a mystery.

How is it possible that the Chinese tell us the opinions of our enemies about our enemies!!! This is great perfidy, but this must have its own great reasons. These two states, the United States of America and China, come together in their anti-Soviet feelings and in the contradictions which both of them have with the Soviet Union. The two sides reckon to benefit from these contradictions.

The whole policy of China with the United States of America was restricted to Indochina, Taiwan, Japan, and Pakistan. According to the Chinese exposition, the Soviet Union does not seem to exist at all, just as Europe, Latin America, Africa, Asia, and all the major complicated world problems do not exist at all. This means to enter the international arena from the kitchen door, if possible without making any noise, lest you spoil the appetite of the great lords who are feasting on the blood and flesh of the peo-

ples. In other words, China tells the United States of America: «Let us be friends in this zone, let us restrain the Soviet Union, I in this part here, you in the other parts of the world, and especially in Europe and Africa. I have no great pretentions to spheres of influence in those countries. I am not taking the least initiative towards India, either», etc.

Hence, I do not think the question is so simple as Chou En-lai is seeking to explain to us with the «diplomacy of chiefs», which the Soviet revisionists carry on with the United States of America, and the «diplomacy of the people», which the Chinese pursue, allegedly to link themselves with the people through the chiefs. No one can swallow this! They say: «It is six of one and half a dozen of the other».

Why does Chou not link himself with the Indian Government in order to link himself with the Indian people? Is it in the interest of China and the revolution to link up first with the American people or with the Indian people? **We ask the questions: Who are closer to the revolution, the Indian people or the American people? Which is the most ferocious and dangerous, Indian reaction, or American imperialism? What has Chou done with the theory which he defends so strongly, «the countryside should encircle the city»? Why do they not work to destroy the influence of American imperialism in India and in the world, so as to weaken the metropolis and imperialism?** Why this persistent defence (which we are not opposed to) of Pakistan to the detriment of approaches to India? The Khan of Pakistan is just as perfidious as Gandhi. But why is China not making attempts to apply the same «brilliant policy» with Japan as it has begun to pursue with the United States of America?

No! This policy is unprincipled and its basis is an

anti-Marxist, anti-revolutionary line. Conciliation is sought with American imperialism, compromises are sought with it, sacrificing principles. The words, «we want to link ourselves with the American people in order to shake the throne of imperialism in the metropolis», are demagogy. **With the Li Hsien-niens, Kuo Mo-jos and others like these going to the USA for visits and meetings with the heads of government, no contact is made with the American people, and neither is the throne of imperialism shaken. Only correct, principled, uncompromising struggle, only the revolution, will dig the grave for imperialism.**

This famous, allegedly new, diplomacy which Mao Tsetung and Chou En-lai are preaching to us is not new, but old. it is a diplomacy of «osmosis». This means, send people from China for America «to educate» them, and send people from America to China in order to «educate» the Chinese. These people who will go to China will be 99 per cent agents of imperialism, and those who will come from China will be revisionists selected by Chou En-lai and his men. A beautiful prospect for China!!

If this revisionist course is not brought to a halt immediately, the China of Mao Tsetung will take the same road that the revisionist Soviet Union took, and here there is the danger that matters will be precipitated and great confusion created.

What is occurring in China interests both the imperialists and the revisionists. The first phase is that of setting China on the road of agreement with the revisionist betrayal, on the road of becoming discredited in the international arena, in the eyes of the peoples and communists. The second phase is the game of the three superpowers, of new combinations, of the balance of forces, of more severe quarrels in the international arena.

The peoples and the Marxist-Leninists must fight with

self-sacrifice to stop this retrogressive world course. The onerous historic role of standing in the forefront of this struggle and leading it, devolves on our small but heroic Marxist-Leninist Party. We shall fight and we shall triumph, because we are on the road of Lenin and Stalin.

DURRËS, TUESDAY
JULY 27, 1971

AN ANTI-MARXIST LINE-UP

In essence, the Chinese stand against the Soviet revisionists expresses pronounced great-state chauvinist views, though the Chinese carefully try to disguise them. They continually re-emphasize, «we are not a great state», «we shall not become a superpower», «we combat the great-state feeling in the cadres and the people», but the reality does not always show this, and when it comes to stands for which it is necessary at least to seek the opinion of others «who are smaller», because this opinion is indispensable, they do not do this, and become angry when this «negligence» is pointed out. The Chinese comrades think that others ought to approve everything which they say or do, they think that every word and action of theirs should be considered as a treasure for Marxism-Leninism and be applied everywhere. Typical of this is the question of the Cultural Revolution which is going on today in China, which without the slightest modesty, they describe as obligatory for all, without considering whether or not this revolution will be affirmed in the world communist movement.

In practice, the Chinese comrades regard the newly created Marxist-Leninist parties with disdain. They do not support and do not help these parties, but maintain contacts with all sorts of groups, especially those which

praise Mao Tsetung and the Cultural Revolution, irrespective of what tendency these groups have.

Hence their «anti-revisionism» towards the Khrushchevites is not based on the Marxist-Leninist ideology. They do not fight Soviet revisionism from principled positions. On the contrary, for the Chinese whoever is anti-Soviet, is fine, he is lined up with them, irrespective of who these anti-Soviet elements are: whether they are Titoite revisionists, betrayers of Marxism-Leninism, agents of the Americans, Rumanian revisionists, linked with the Americans and with European reaction, or reactionary bourgeois. You need only be anti-Soviet to have the sympathy of the Chinese.

This anti-Marxist stand has now led China into a blind alley, on to a course which, if it does not stop, leads to betrayal. Imperialism and modern revisionism are aware of these anti-Marxist views of China in the policy which it pursues against the Soviet Union, and both of them are in action to exploit them to the maximum.

Between the Soviet revisionists and the Yugoslav and Rumanian revisionists there are occasional, natural contradictions, but the three of them are working together to undermine the bases of socialism in China. These three revisionist plotters are concocting threats, resorting to enticement and pressure against one another, retreats, etc., in a masterly way, in order to create the impression in China, blinded by anti-Sovietism, that there is a fight to death between Yugoslavia and Rumania, on the one side, and the Soviet Union, on the other side, and that China «must defend the weaker, because in this way it defends the peoples».

China lines itself up with Yugoslavia and Rumania without looking at who they are, in order to incite their contradictions with the Soviet Union. Rumania and Yugoslavia, themselves, are certainly inciting these contradic-

tions, indeed more than it is necessary, in order to get China completely into the trap. **In fact nothing divides China and Rumania. They are completely in agreement with each other in policy and in ideology, and declare that their parties are sisters.** This means that for China, the Rumanian revisionist party and the revisionist group of Ceausescu are Marxist-Leninist. This is over and done with. China's support for Rumania in its political steps, in economic and military aid, is assured.

It is very scandalous and anti-Marxist that communist China should declare itself a sister and comrade of revisionist Rumania, which is totally committed to the Warsaw Treaty and Comecon, which receives aid from these, from the Americans, from the revanchists of Bonn, etc. On top of this, the Rumanian revisionists are also recognized on account of their «valour». One must have completely lost one's bearings to plunge into this quagmire. These actions have an out-and-out anti-Marxist logic.

China's links with Titoite Yugoslavia, also, are on anti-Marxist foundations. The Chinese have never been convinced that Tito is a renegade from Marxism-Leninism. The Communist Party of China found itself beside us in the struggle against Titoism for reasons of expediency, since it could do nothing else, just as even today, also for expediency, it is unable to declare itself in solidarity with the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia. **For the time being, it is dangerous for it to declare that socialism is being built in Yugoslavia and that the League of «Communists» of Yugoslavia is a Marxist party.** But this could come about tomorrow. «For the moment,» think the Chinese, «we are developing and intensifying our state, economic and cultural relations, and we are content that 'the sister Party of Rumania' is 'a sister of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia'». Hence, the sister of my sister

is my sister. Apart from their common anti-Soviet aim, the relations of China with Tito have a further aim. The Chinese have a special, though unadmitted, admiration for the universal policy of Tito in the «third world», for the «prestige» of this politician paid by the Americans, for his «mastery» in ardently serving the Americans, and on the other hand, abusing them in order to disguise himself. The Chinese want to benefit to the maximum from all these «positive» aspects of Tito, and as quickly as possible, because they have lost a great deal of time. And in making up for the lost time, with its approach to the policy of Tito, Ceausescu, Nixon and Brezhnev, and all world reaction, China enabled them to score a great success.

The «far-sighted» anti-Marxist policy of China has lined the People's Republic of China up with thé Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, and the People's Republic of Rumania. Nixon is to visit Peking after he has visited Bucharest and Belgrade. Three «socialist» countries, bring out the people to welcome the executioner of nations with flowers. Bucharest and Belgrade at least had diplomatic relations, had long been in the service of American imperialism, but China *qu'allait-elle faire dans cette galère**, as Molière once said. Of course, all that I explained above set China on this course.

The whole foreign policy of the People's Republic of China is undefined, chaotic, a vacillating pragmatic policy, sometimes isolated and wrong, sometimes open, as it is now, but still wrong. Chou En-lai, with his right opportunist views, makes the foreign policy of China. He consults no one, decides himself, sometimes getting general approval in principle from Mao.

For China, Europe is no longer of any value in the

---

* What took her there? (from Molière's comedy «Les Fourberies de Scapin» (1671), act II, scene VII).

revolution. The mighty strikes and demonstrations of the European working class are of no value in Chou's eyes. For him only a few demonstrations in Washington are of value. Likewise, the Marxist-Leninist parties, which have been created, are worthless to Chou. In Europe, Rumania makes the policy of China. Since Rumania and Yugoslavia are in agreement with the «European Security» conference, China, too, declares that it is in agreement. China praises and approves the Titoite policy in Lusaka and the «third world» in the hope that it may be able to snatch a bone. But to be in accord with Rumania and Yugoslavia in European policy means to be in accord with American policy.

Chou En-lai says a number of absurd things in the information which he gives us on Nixon's visit to China. He pretends that France, too, permits the entry of Britain into the European Common Market in order to strengthen the anti-American position of these countries. To think in this way means you understand nothing about politics. Pompidou is not De Gaulle. For the French bourgeoisie, its traditional allies have been and still are the Anglo-Saxon countries: the United States of America and Britain. Germany has been the traditional enemy of France and likewise of Britain. In any situation, Britain will seek support from the United States of America, notwithstanding that Chou En-lai has ordered «Renmin Ribao» to write about the old American Civil War in order to sweeten the beautiful news of Nixon's going to Peking for the Chinese people. Regardless of the contradictions which it has with the United States of America, Britain's entry into the Common Market is in favour of the American policy in Europe. The acceptance by France of Britain's entry into this organization is not so much to oppose the United States of America, as to balance Bonn's Germany and from fear of an eventual Bonn-Moscow alliance.

Time will verify all these things, but during this period, China is making grave mistakes in principle for which it and the world will pay a heavy price. We must try, if we have the possibility, to stop this adventurous course of China. The letter which we are preparing for the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China is one of these attempts. This letter may cost us dear, but we must make no concessions over principles. We must defend the Marxist-Leninist principles of our Party to the end.

DURRËS, WEDNESDAY
JULY 28, 1971

CHINA, VIETNAM, KOREA, AND NIXON'S VISIT TO PEKING

For years on end, North Vietnam has been waging an heroic fight against American imperialism. It has been burned to ashes by the bombing, but has not surrendered. On the contrary, it has continued its heroic resistance and the war in the South. The people of South Vietnam have fought and are fighting heroically against American imperialism and the puppets of Saigon.

The Americans are continuing to wage one of the most barbarous wars the world has ever seen. The American barbarians have used all the tactics, all the tricks, all types of weapons invented so far, apart from atomic weapons, but they have not won. They have been smashed, beaten, and are on the verge of defeat.

The fight of the Vietnamese is admirable. The Soviet revisionists have made every effort to make the Vietnamese stop the war, to enter into negotiations and reach a compromise with the Americans. The Soviet revisionists have been the scabs in the Vietnam war. They sought to save the United States of America with an «honourable» withdrawal, while defending their own interests in Vietnam afterwards, in order to become «participants in the victory achieved». The great pressure, scandalously exerted by the Soviets on the Vietnamese, achieved a result: The Vietnamese began the talks with the Americans in

Paris according to the slogan: «Both war and politics and negotiations».

China has assisted and is assisting the Vietnamese in the war. It has been ready even to send volunteers at any time. The Chinese were against the talks of the Vietnamese with the Americans. They had told them this many times, and have told us officially, too. The Chinese considered the talks of the Vietnamese with the Americans incorrect, unfruitful, and indeed harmful and dangerous, but this was a matter for the Vietnamese themselves, while China's stand towards the war of the Vietnamese people and its aid did not alter.

Our Party, without consulting with China (because the Chinese do not bother to consult with our Party even over these capital problems), when a stand towards the war in Vietnam had to be taken, took the stand which is publicly known and never spared its aid to this war. We were not in agreement with the talks which the Vietnamese began with the Americans. We have told the Vietnamese comrades of our opinion on several occasions. This is how matters have stood right up to now.

Irrespective that China and Albania were not in agreement with the Paris talks, in the final analysis, this was the business of the Vietnamese. We could not stop them. On the other hand, we had to continue and did continue to assist their liberation war even more, to expose the atrocities of the Americans, and to be consistent in our stand. We remained consistent in our support for Vietnam's war, but not China. **When the war was still going on, when the Americans were killing and bombing in Vietnam and the whole of Indochina, China held secret talks with the Americans in which the agreement was reached that Nixon should go to Peking and, as it turned out, discussions about Vietnam were also held.**

These disgraceful, anti-Marxist, uncomradely negotia-

lions were held without the knowledge of the Vietnamese, let alone any knowledge on our part. This was scandalous. This was a betrayal of the Chinese towards the Vietnamese, towards their war, towards us, their allies, and all the other progressive peoples. This is revolting.

The conclussions of Chou En-lai's talks with Kissinger fell like a bombshell on us Albanians, on the Vietnamese, the Koreans, not to mention the others. The Khan of Pakistan was considered worthy to be the first to be informed about «the secrets of the gods». What shamelessness on the part of the Chinese! We base this on the facts. When Chou En-lai summoned our ambassador, at three in the morning, to inform him laconically about «the good news», which was to be published a day later, he told him that he would call him back to inform him more extensively on the matter, so that he could inform the comrades in Tirana, because, he said: «I have just returned from Hanoi where I brought the comrades up to date. Now I am going to Korea to inform Kim Il Sung, and when I return, I shall inform Sihanouk and will call you, too».

We, naturally, were to be informed after the Prince of Cambodia! What does this show? This shows that the Vietnamese, the Koreans, as well as we, were faced with an accomplished fact.

What attitude must the Vietnamese have taken? This we do not know. Chou doesn't give a hint, and we can guess why. The Vietnamese were opposed to Nixon's going to Peking at a time when the Americans were fighting them. Of course, the Vietnamese consider China's stand, as we do, too, aid to the fascist Nixon, the number one murderer of the Vietnamese, so that he can pose as a pacifist and be re-elected president of the United States of America. This means to talk with an enemy about the fate of a people who are fighting and have taken their fate in their own hands, means to talk with the arch-

executioner of a people, without consulting them or asking them, when you, China, have been most sternly opposed to talks with the Americans on the question of the Vietnam war. **On the one hand China criticizes the Soviets and the Vietnamese for talking with the Americans, and on the other hand, reaches agreement itself find talks with them in secret! This is cheating, this is neither honest nor Marxist.** The Vietnamese immediately published an article in which they expressed their displeasure while attacking the United States of America and Nixon, and said that they would not allow the great powers to gamble with their fate.

This about-turn of China in its stand towards Vietnam is disgraceful and is explained with the change of its line to a rapprochement with the United States of America. The Chinese are making another major mistake to justify this shitty business of theirs. In the information which he gave our ambassador, Chou En-lai said: «We foresee that the war in Vietnam will continue; therefore, as we told the comrades in Hanoi, they should fight and, at the same time, we should talk».

Of course, this has revolted the Vietnamese, and quite rightly so, because those who were against talks now come and tell them: «You go on fighting, shed your blood and we shall talk here in Peking and in Washington». This means, in other words, if victory comes in Vietnam, the Mao-Nixon talks brought this, that is, the victory is due to the Chinese and not to those who were killed and burned. No! Such things are unacceptable, in no way are they acceptable.

The North Koreans, with Kim Il Sung at the head, as the centrists they are, are pleased with these political somersaults of the Chinese in many directions, but in some other directions they are not in agreement with them. After the information which Chou gave them, they, too, published

an article in which they put the stress on opposition to American imperialism and Japanese militarism, etc. But what has pleased the Koreans? They have been pleased with the turn to the right of the Chinese, which will bring them to the centrist position of the Koreans. But Kim Il Sung does not like China's great-state chauvinist position. He judges this from his own nationalist position, equidistant between the Soviet Union and China. Kim Il Sung likes the support of China against the Japanese danger and indirectly is pleased with the friendship which is developing between China and the United States of America, but he is afraid of the growing tension between China and the Soviet Union. Therefore, he will manoeuvre and will work to serve as a bridge between China and the Soviet Union, to bring these two revisionist states closer together. Kim Il Sung is in a better position than Ceausescu to play the card of the Soviets with the Chinese, while Ceausescu is the card of the Americans with the Chinese. The love and «sound» unity of views which was manifested between Korea and Rumania on the occasion of Ceausescu's visit to Korea were not accidental.

The Chinese have begun to praise Korea a great deal. They have begun to call Kim Il Sung a great leader, while yesterday they told us officially, «He has no value at all; he has been a corporal in the Chinese army», etc. *O tempora, o mores!** What will our ears hear and our eyes see!! This is only the beginning, but a very ominous beginning.

Mao Tsetung must abandon this road immediately. This road cannot be defended as the Chinese propagandists are doing by saying, «Lenin, too, held talks with the Mensheviks», «Lenin, too, talked with the Germans at Brest». Tomorrow these propagandists will certainly be saying, «Stalin, too, signed the non-aggression pact with

---

* Latin in the original.

Hitler». The bourgeoisie has constantly used these «arguments», but has broken its head on them, because neither Lenin nor Stalin ever fell into mistakes of principle, they never violated principles. Their actions were clear, time and the unerring theory of Marxism-Leninism have made them completely clear.

DURRËS, FRIDAY
AUGUST 13, 1971

THE SOVIET-INDIAN TREATY AND CHINA

Last week, in Delhi, Gromyko signed the treaty of «friendship and co-operation» between the Soviet Union and India, or in other words, signed the Soviet-Indian treaty against People's China.

Close friendly relations, created and strengthened in the time of Khrushchev, exist between the Soviet revisionists and Indian reaction. The India of Nehru, which was in a neutral position, of course only in appearance, between the Soviet Union and the United States of America, and in hostility with China, maintained the position of the «third force», and indeed Nehru was one of its main leaders. It fed from two mangers, took aid from the Soviet Union and the United States of America, and also took part in the Commonwealth, but in appearance, leaned more to the Soviets, who gave great publicity to this friendship, supplied large amounts of aid, fostered Nehru's hostility towards China, and encouraged his ambitions towards Pakistan. Basing themselves on this policy, the Khrushchevites naturally, took advantage of it to penetrate and influence the so-called third world.

Certainly the Indian sub-continent had great strategic importance for the Soviet social-imperialists who wanted to exploit it in the forms of neo-colonialism, to have it as a major base for the encirclement of China, to neutralize American imperialism in the Indian and Pacific Oceans

and to prevent the development and outburst of revolution in India.

The so-called communist party of Dange in India went over to the Soviet revisionists and worked for their aims. Those who replaced Khrushchev and Nehru continued the course set by their predecessors. Kosygin and Bahadur, as long as the latter lived, not only worked hand in glove to conquer Pakistan, but also solved the problem of Kashmir, naturally in favour of India. Later Indira Gandhi also followed this same course. Indeed she went even further, threw off the «non-aligned» disguise and formed a treaty with the Soviet revisionists.

The question may be asked: Is anything abnormal here between the social-imperialists and Indian reaction? Nothing. On the contrary, one can see some skill in the expansionist policy of the Soviet revisionists, a «concurrence» in the pursuit of their line of the encirclement of China and continuous support for the aggressiveness of Indian reaction against Pakistan and «its friends». Indian reaction nurtures pretentions towards Tibet, too, and India's borders with China are being constantly contested. Indian reaction even attacked these borders, but suffered an ignominious defeat. On this question the Khrushchevites openly and consistently took the side of their friends, the Indian reactionaries.

China began approaches to Pakistan, obviously as a counter-weight to India. This was a correct state policy of China and this policy continues, but I think that it should not go beyond all bounds and consider all the actions of the Khan of Pakistan correct and supportable. Ayub Khan, Yahya Khan, Aga Khan, and the devil and his son are nothing but reactionaries, just as much as Nehru and his daughter. Both groups barbarously oppress their peoples who live in indescribable misery. **It is not in order for a socialist state, in its policy with the other**

states, to forget the main idea of assisting the peoples to liberate themselves from internal and foreign bondage. East Pakistan rose against the Khan. The oppressed population there rose in revolt under the leadership of Rahman, for Bangladesh. There were armed clashes. Does Indian reaction have a finger in this? Of course it does. But to declare oneself immediately pro-Khan and to make a commitment that, if Pakistan is attacked by India, China will come to the aid of Pakistan, means to make common cause with the Khan, notwithstanding that from the state angle, the Khan will defend the borders of his state. But the question of the Bengalis and of the whole Indian people is a very important one. In our opinion, China has ignored this great problem in an arbitrary manner.

Despite the well-known stands of Nehru, Bahadur Shastri and Indira Gandhi, as far as we know, China did not make any effort to improve its relations with India, with the major objective of neutralizing the Soviet-American influence there. The Chinese who like to pose as patient, did not display this quality here but displayed the opposite. To take the side of one Khan (who is also linked by treaty with the United States of America) against another Khan, and to consider this stand «the diplomacy of the people», doesn't make sense. Your friend Khan will leave you in the lurch whenever he likes, but the people will not do this if you really develop a policy for the people.

Is it permissible for China to pursue such a policy of refusing to approach India? In my opinion, no. When China is making all these concessions to Nixon, the head of American imperialism, the maintenance of such a stand towards India is astonishing. Meanwhile the Soviets have acted skilfully. They signed the Soviet-Indian treaty and strengthened their positions in India, told Indian reaction and the «Indian people»: «Don't fear either China or the United States of America, because if anyone at-

tacks you we shall enter the war on your side». The treaty of which we spoke, concluded at this time, tells the world that it «was signed against the Sino-American alliance which is in the wind». On the other hand, China now finds itself officially encircled by war treaties: by the old treaties of SEATO and CENTO, etc., and now by this Soviet-Indian treaty. The «wise policy» of Mao and Chou En-lai of opening towards the United States of America and their «diplomacy of the people» precipitated this.

The encirclement of China will be extended. The day after Gromyko left Delhi, the Foreign Minister of India, Singh, left for Djakarta to reach agreement with the Indonesian fascists. It is said that China sent a person to Malaysia as a counter-weight. What a miserable, incoherent, pragmatic policy, an opportunist subjective policy of people who have lost their bearings in the flow of events!

From this policy it appears that «Japan has become the main threat to China», then comes the Soviet Union, and the Chinese are going to stop them with «their new friendship with Nixon, with Tito's Yugoslavia and Ceausescu's Rumania»!

There are three cardinal points of the «positive» policy of China: the talks with Nixon, the friendship with Ceausescu, and the relations established with Tito. For the Chinese, the two latter «are going to undermine the Soviets in Europe»! And the relations with the United States of America will also restrain the Soviets and the Japanese in Asia! But it never crosses the mind of the Chinese that they arc in opportunist positions, are isolating themselves, are being encircled and discredited in the eyes of the people, are being weakened and, if they do not react, will become the prey of enemies.

With such a policy China cannot break the Soviet-Japanese-American ring of fire in favour of the cause

of socialism. The interests of these powers are very great and complicated. The links with the Khan of Pakistan cannot break this front. Only revolutionary struggle and revolutionary diplomacy, only the links with the peoples are a match for the enemies.

The Soviets are sure to commence to concretize friendship with Japan, while during this period, the Chinese are interested to learn from us whether we know anything about what was discussed in Crimea, whether they decided to attack Rumania as Czechoslovakia was attacked?!!! It is truly hard to understand this policy, a policy which has no stable axis and which swings from side to side.

We shall see how this policy develops later. Let us hope that Mao Tsetung will re-examine this strategy which the Chinese policy is pursuing.

DURRËS, SUNDAY
AUGUST 15, 1971

THE MANOEUVRES OF THE CHINESE IN THE BALKANS

Today a delegation of the army of the PR of China, including all arms, headed by the Director of the General Political Directory, Li Teh-sheng, comes to Tirana. It comes as a friendly delegation, but not especially to Albania. This delegation was destined, in particular, for Rumania, which has the anniversary of its Liberation on the 23rd of this month. The Chinese comrades requested that their delegation should come on to our country after it had been to Bucharest. We, of course, accepted this, but expressed the opinion that this delegation should come first to Albania and then go to Rumania. Therefore, we notified the Chinese comrades that their proposal was fully accepted, but if they found it reasonable, we would welcome the delegation in Tirana first and from here it could go on to Bucharest.

The Chinese accepted Our proposal, but we gained nothing from this change that we sought. We did not alter anything in the aims of the Chinese. In fact, perhaps it would have been better for us if the Chinese delegation had come after Bucharest, so that world opinion would see that it had gone especially to Rumania and «when it had finished its business 'with its notable friend' on the European continent, it would go to Albania, too». It has

one significance when it comes from Rumania and another when it comes first to us.

After all, why should every action which China is to take in Europe have to pass through us? This pretention would not be correct, because we are modest and never consider ourselves «the hub of the earth». **When our friends do not consult us about their intended political activity, why should we be implicated, even formally, from the external aspect, in, those events and over those questions about which we are not of the same opinion as they? Hence we should not set dangerous precedents, which might prove costly later.**

Let us take the question of sending the Chinese delegation to Rumania. The main aim of the Chinese is to support the anti-Sovietism of the Rumanians and to stir up the hostile contradictions between the Rumanians and the Soviets. **The Rumanians' contradictions with the Soviets are not on a Marxist basis but on a nationalist basis.** Both the Rumanian and the Soviet leaders are revisionists. The Rumanians are members of Comecon and the Warsaw Treaty. They receive credits from and carry on a large amount of trade with the Soviet Union, but do not want to submit to many things of the Soviets, who are threatening them, exerting blackmail and intimidating them.

The policy of the Rumanian revisionist leaders is the same as the policy of Tito: close friendship with the United States of America, Bonn, Italy and with all the capitalist states. Now Rumania has come out as the close friend of China, which is assisting, defending, and supporting Rumania, precisely because of this political line. Naturally, we cannot be in accord with China on this question. **We oppose the Soviet revisionists' interference in Rumania or Yugoslavia, we are for, and will help, the preservation of the independence and sovereignty of these**

two countries from the threats of the Soviet revisionists and the imperialists. But we can never link our correct policy with the adventurous policy of the Titoites and the Rumanian revisionists. Should we be in solidarity with them in this stinking policy of theirs? In no way! Not only will we never do this, but neither will we allow these two revisionist states, or China either, to create the impression among the world opinion that we are making common cause with them. We shall stand beside Rumania and Yugoslavia, if these two states are attacked from abroad, but only on condition that they fight arms in hand against their invaders and provided NATO, or any member of it, does not come to their aid, because in the latter case, the war loses its liberation character and takes the course of an imperialist war.

As we are seeing, in the Balkans and Europe the Chinese have set out on a policy which we cannot follow completely, as they intend it. Their policy in the Balkans and in Europe is «friendship with all those who are in opposition to the Soviets», without asking who they are, whether they are pro-Americans, Titoites, etc. For them this has no importance. This policy is without perspective and is not on the correct Marxist-Leninist course. To encourage the contradictions, to defend the peoples, to assist the revolution, to observe the flow of the policy and events, it seems to me, are major problems and not so simple as the Chinese think.

The Rumanian revisionists have based themselves on the Yugoslav revisionists. It would not be surprising if there were secret agreements between them, which the Soviets know about, but which they do not mention because this is to their advantage, or because they have their own plans in this game. Tito relies on the Americans and NATO. Between Yugoslavia, Greece and Turkey, there is an alliance which for the moment is dormant,

but which could be activized in case of danger. The Yugoslavs and the Rumanians are doing everything in their power to get us into their tow. In this way, they think, «this makes three socialist countries» against the Soviet Union, plus Greece and Turkey, thus the whole of the Balkans is in the Titoite-American plot. We must not forget that, several years ago, Chou En-lai told Beqir Balluku that we must move in this direction.

The old dream of Tito and the Anglo-Americans, their attempts of the time of Stalin and their present attempts are all parts of the one series!! The Chinese have fallen into these stinking waters, but not us. We shall not set foot on a rotten plank, even if this means sacrificing our friendship with China. We shall fight alone if need be, but will march straight ahead and will not become involved in the intrigues of the great powers.

The visit of the Chinese delegation to Rumania and its coming on to us is intended to give world opinion the impression that Yugoslavia, Rumania and Albania are «in solidarity», even in military solidarity, against the Soviet Union. Without our approval, but taking advantage of the Albanian-Chinese friendship, the Chinese are coming to the aid of the Rumanians and the Yugoslavs in this direction in order to create this impression.

Three days ago, a Hungarian newspaper reported that Chou En-lai will be visiting Tirana, Belgrade and Bucharest in the autumn. How true this is we do not know, but it is possible that the Chinese would do such a scandalous thing. Chou En-lai told Tepavac, the Yugoslav Foreign Minister, «If I come to Europe I shall come to Yugoslavia, too». Naturally, if they do this, this is very dangerous for us. We could not be in agreement with either the content, or the form of this tour; could not be in agreement with their propaganda, either, because all the Chinese, the Titoites and the Rumanians want is to

include Albania in this tour, even if formally. We will be obliged to tell the Chinese our views openly, as always. Chou En-lai is welcome to come at any time, but not in these circumstances. We do not prohibit him from going to Belgrade, to Bucharest, to Moscow, or to Washington if he likes. But these problems and the way the Chinese understand and apply them, will cause trouble for us, therefore we must judge them coolly and settle them coolly, in the Marxist-Leninist road and in the interests of our socialist Homeland.

A great propaganda campaign is being conducted blown up by the Yugoslavs, the Rumanians and the bourgeois press that the Soviet Union is going to attack Yugoslavia and Rumania. Naturally, they mention Albania, too. For their part, the Chinese, in close contact with the Rumanians and the Yugoslavs, have fallen for this trap and are seriously worried about the fate of Yugoslavia and Rumania. The Chinese ambassadors are trying, in naive ways, to persuade us to believe these things and even report to us the alleged «facts», with which the Yugoslav generals provide them, about the meaning of Soviet manoeuvres in Hungary and Bulgaria. This whole business of the Chinese is like the work of recent converts, who have faith in their new friendships, which they exalt. However, that is their affair.

There is no disputing the fact that the Soviets are putting pressure on Rumania. They are implanting fear among the Rumanians, and are creating and will create internal difficulties for them. The Soviets will take the castle from within in Rumania, if not today, tomorrow. Rumania is encircled. Will they attack it with arms? They are capable of anything, but in the existing situation this does not seem likely. The Soviets can easily occupy Rumania with an attack, but if they do such a thing they will lose a great deal politically.

Likewise, the Soviets are exerting blackmail on Yugoslavia, although they are certain that they cannot frighten the Yugoslavs. They know that blood will be shed in Yugoslavia, but I think that it is difficult for the Soviet Union to attack Yugoslavia. Even the czars did not do this. On the contrary, they were the most loyal defenders of the Serbs and the Montenegrins, etc. And the Soviet revisionists will not dare to attack Yugoslavia either, because this would be madness. Tito knows this very well. Only the Chinese do not know it, but they are swallowing what Tito tells them. The Soviets are putting pressure on and blackmailing Tito to make him soften his policy towards them, break off his solidarity with the Rumanians, and work for them politically in the international arena. Tito is wriggling like an eel, while the Soviets are taking advantage of the troubled situation within Yugoslavia. Tito is not allowing them and their friends, the great Serbs, to do what they like. This is the basis of their contradictions and frictions, but this is far removed from an armed attack. This situation is of advantage to Tito in some ways, but not in others. It is not to his advantage internally, but nevertheless it prevails, while abroad, he uses it to get colossal credits and aid from the Americans and others.

We are aware of all these things. We know Tito well, we know the cunning tricks he and the Soviets are capable of. They might do anything if they see themselves hard pressed (but the signs do not indicate this). The big noise which is being made throughout the world by the great powers in their rivalry and in their bid for hegemony will bring something to light, and I think that this shows precisely that dangerous something which is being prepared. Therefore we must keep our heads cool, preserve the clarity of our thinking and our revolutionary vigilance.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 24, 1971

WHAT THE NEWS AGENCIES SAY ABOUT CHINA

These days the various news agencies are clamouring about «something» that is going on in China. They say that the day of the proclamation of the Republic, the 1st of October, will not be celebrated and there will be no parade (the Chinese comrades confirm this with unsound reasons); that flights of aircraft in China have been cancelled (the Chinese comrades confirm this, too, as do our airmen who were in China); that allegedly Lin Piao has fled, assisted by the Chief of Staff of the Chinese army (the reason that they tell us: we must be vigilant towards the Soviets?!!); that allegedly Mao Tsetung is ill with a heart complaint or is dead (they spread these rumours every year), or that a meeting of the Central Committee is being held and within it there is struggle between the liberal faction and the «hard-line» faction. Who can you believe? It is possible that all these are mere tales. We shall see!

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 14, 1971

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA IS NOT SENDING A DELEGATION TO THE 6th CONGRESS OF THE PARTY OF LABOUR OF ALBANIA

The Chinese ambassador in Tirana communicated this news to us and Keng Biao communicated it to our ambassador in Peking. We did not expect such a thing. It never crossed our minds that the Communist Party of China would make such a public «challenge» to our Party.

What are the reasons they gave?

1) That at their last congress they decided not to invite delegations of sister parties to their congresses and not to send delegations of the Communist Party of China to the congresses of sister parties.

2) That the international communist movement at present is not as it was before, many Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, which have not yet confirmed themselves and appear to be divided, have been formed, and indeed in various countries there are two or three such parties, etc., etc.

3) That the comrades of the leadership are very occupied with state and internal party affairs at present and are unable to leave their country, etc.

However, the Chinese ambassador added, «The Communist Party of China will send a message of greetings to the 6th Congress of the PLA and good wishes for the 30th anniversary of the founding of the Party of Labour of

Albania, articles will be published in our newspapers, and mass meetings will be held in work centres», etc.

These are the famous reasons which they give for not coming to the 6th Congress of our Party. All these reasons are without foundation, incorrect, and some of them are lies. Let us analyse them one by one.

The congress of the Communist Party of China has not taken such a decision as they claim. It is logical that the Central Committee or the Political Bureau should make such a decision. Such a decision could be taken, but at definite moments and in specific instances, and should not become a principle as it is put to us by the Chinese comrades. They decided not to invite delegations to the 9th Congress of their Party. This is normal and no one could oppose it. They could also have taken a decision, as they did, not to come to the 6th Congress of our Party. From the formal aspect this is a right they have, but it is not permissible for them to lie about it. The Central Committee, the Political Bureau, or certain leaders may have taken the decision not to send a delegation to the congress of our Party, but not the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China. With this uncouth manoeuvre they want to cover up the action of the leadership by calling it the implementation of the decision of the 9th Congress of their Party, that is «cutting off one's nose to spite one's face». This decision was taken recently, in the middle of September. Two events prove this:

a) In June, they told a comrade of the Communist Party of Poland who was in China and wanted to come to Albania: «Stay until October and **go together with the delegation of our Party which will go to the Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania».**

b) An Indonesian comrade asked us two or three days ago: **With what airline can I come to Tirana to take part**

in the 6th Congress of the PLA, because the Chinese comrades told me previously that I could come together with the Chinese delegation which was to be headed by Li Hsien-nien, but now they have informed me that they are not going to send a delegation.

Thus, these facts prove that this is not a decision of the congress, that a decision to send a delegation to the 6th Congress of our Party had been taken and was retracted following the letter which we sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in which we expressed our opinion in connection with Nixon's going to Peking. It also turns out that this decision was taken after September 1, when the manifestations and parades in Tien An Men were stopped and cancelled, when an aircraft crashed deep in Mongolian territory, when military and civil flights were banned in China, the airports closed, etc.

These things are true, while the name of Lin Piao, in fact, has not been mentioned at all since that time, in the speeches of the Chinese at receptions which are given either in China or outside. The Chinese ambassador here, who mentioned the name of Lin Piao together with that of Mao at every moment, now does not mention even the latter so that the void will not be noticed.

There is a great deal of speculation in the outside world about this question and the main rumour goes like this: **Lin Piao and his comrades have been eliminated because they opposed Nixon's going to Peking. Then, if this is true (we think it must be true), the failure to send a delegation to the 6th Congress of our Party is opposition to our Party on matters of principle. We are convinced of this because we are well aware of the waverings in line of the Chinese and the revisionist position of the group of Chou En-lai, who, in fact, has triumphed**

over the others and operates assisted by Mao and under his shadow.

Hence, the views we expressed in our letter have coincided with the views of the Lin Piao group. The Central Committee of the Communist Party of China not only did not reply to our letter and did not show any reaction, but when our agricultural delegation went to the PR of China, they willingly accepted our requests for agriculture.

We came to the conclusion that they would give us their reply to the letter orally, through the leader of their delegation which would come to the Congress of our Party, on which the decision had been taken. Apparently, however, their internal affairs were complicated «with the opposition of the Lin Piao group». If we accept this version, then it can be said that the question was complicated for them because «they condemned Lin Piao over the problem of Nixon», which means that they are in opposition over principles to our line about this question, and if they had come to the Congress of our Party, then they would have had to give us the reply to the letter which we sent them in connection with Nixon's visit to China, but at the same time would have had to tell us the reasons for «the condemnation of Lin Piao». This would not have worked out for them, therefore it is supposed that they found the way out by not sending the delegation, in order to avoid making matters worse in relations with our Party.

(At the meeting of the Political Bureau, I submitted a series of other arguments which confirm the correct line of our Party and the revisionist views of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, therefore I do not want to dwell any further on this point.)

The second reason which the Chinese comrades give for not sending a delegation of the Communist Party of China to the Congress of our Party does not hold water

at all. **We are holding the Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania and not a meeting of international communism. Hence, you are coming to the Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania and not to some meeting of the Marxist-Leninist parties of the world.** You, the Communist Party of China, have taken the decision not to invite sister parties to your congress and this is a matter which is up to you, while the Party of Labour of Albania has decided to invite delegations and this is a matter which is up to it.

But the fundamental problem does not lie in this right, it lies elsewhere: **The Communist Party of China has no confidence in the new Marxist-Leninist parties and groups which are being created, which are struggling and consolidating themselves, purging and tempering themselves. This is a revolutionary dialectical process. The Communist Party of China does not want to be stuck together with them, it is afraid of this and this is in conformity with its vacillating revisionist line. It displays complete solidarity with the revisionist party of Rumania, but has its eye on other revisionist parties, too.** While not wanting to be stuck together with them, it wants all the other parties to praise it, to hold bilateral talks, but to avoid giving any aid to the entire movement of international communism. The Communist Party of China, with two or more lines in its ranks, maintains contact with any kind of party or group which allegedly calls itself Marxist-Leninist and which praises it. Whereas the Party of Labour of Albania, for its part, maintains a revolutionary Marxist-Leninist stand towards the world communist movement and Marxist-Leninist parties and groups, which it aids and supports, while it condemns those which deviate from Marxist-Leninist principles.

In regard to the third reason which the Chinese give, if we accept the version that disturbances, of which I have written, have occurred in the leadership of the

Communist Party of China, then the reason for the failure of the delegation of this party to come is explained. But if nothing serious has occurred, to say that «we are not sending a delegation because the comrades are very busy», this is not only absurd, but also hostile towards the Party of Labour of Albania. (I explained this situation in greater detail in a meeting of the Political Bureau and I don't need to extend on it.)

Every cloud has a silver lining. Reaction and the revisionists will make the most of this anti-Marxist action of the leadership of the Communist Party of China, but the international communist movement will judge how right our Party has been in its line and how wrong the Communist Party of China is on this question.

The world will see, also, and will judge that Albania is indomitable, that the Party of Labour of Albania is indomitable. Within our country, the failure to send a delegation of the Communist Party of China to the Congress of our Party will not have any negative effect, on the contrary, **our Party and our people, who have passed through so many tempests, will become stronger and more steeled. The unity amongst us will reach its highest, the enthusiasm of the people for the Party will be indescribable.**

For the international communist movement, of course, this opportunist revisionist line of the Communist Party of China is not good, because it weakens and confuses it. But everything will be overcome.

Let us fight and let us hope that the Chinese comrades will restrain themselves. (In regard to our stands, also, I spoke at length at the meeting of the Political Bureau, therefore it is not necessary to extend on them here.)

TUESDAY
OCTOBER 26, 1971

THE ADMISSION OF CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

The vote was taken yesterday, at midnight, and our resolution, which sought the admission of China to the United Nations Organization with its full rights and the expulsion from this organization of the corpse of Chiang Kai-shek, won with 76 votes in favour. The American resolution got only 35 votes. American imperialism suffered a major political defeat. The courageous, consistent and stern struggle against the United States of America was led by the People's Republic of Albania.

A small but indomitable socialist country triumphed over the most powerful imperialist state. We fought for a great and just cause, therefore we triumphed. Our opponents were omnipotent in the United Nations Organization and at their head stood the United States of America. The Soviets, in fact, were in agreement with the USA and the voting of the Soviet revisionists, allegedly in favour of China, was only a formality to avoid exposing their agreement with the United States of America in the efforts to keep China out of the United Nations Organization. Any other stand would have ruined things, would have created great problems for them, and made them lose their influence and upset the status quo which they had created.

These two superpowers dominated the United Nations

Organization while the others, to a greater or lesser extent, followed them. Only socialist Albania attacked the two of them and their satellites courageously at each session and over every problem, against every intrigue and diabolical plan. This was the reality, and this reality was crowned with success with the admission of the People's Republic of China to the United Nations Organization.

It is socialist China which, with its great prestige at home and abroad, in the international arena, brought about the defeat of its enemies and their obstructionist policy which kept China outside the United Nations Organization for decades. China's weight in the world is great.

Our Party defended China with all Ms strength. We defended China alone, against everyone at Bucharest, while all the others had the Soviet revisionists at the head of them and the support of American imperialism and world reaction. We defended China, Mao Tsetung, and the Cultural Revolution, because we defended Marxism-Leninism. We remained alone, but we were neither shaken nor intimidated, and faced up to the terrible tempests which hurled themselves against China and us.

Our stands towards China have always been principled, open and sincere, notwithstanding that many of its stands and actions, in various situations, have been unclear, opportunist and revisionist. We did not lose confidence in the Communist Party of China, but we guarded and guard the Marxist-Leninist principles like the apple of our eye and have never failed to state our comradely disapproval whenever it has been necessary, regardless of how this would be received.

Hence, the correct, revolutionary, Marxist-Leninist line of our Party and Government in the world diplomatic field wars a powerful contribution to the admission of the

People's Republic of China to the United Nations Organization.

It is natural and just that the authority of the People's Republic of Albania should be raised even higher in the world. The foreign press says: **David did battle with Goliath for years on end and little Albania triumphed, great America was defeated.** We were confident of this victory, just as we are confident that this defeat is not the first and will not be the last for the United States of America.

This great international event will have major consequences in world problems. A great deal depends on the policy which the People's Republic of China will follow. If it pursues a wise, skilful, and, especially, a principled Marxist-Leninist policy, then this will be greatly to the advantage of the revolution and the liberation struggles of the peoples.

As far as we are concerned, we shall continue our course, our line, our fight for the defence of Marxism-Leninism, socialism and communism. We shall continue uninterruptedly to provide our aid for the peoples who are fighting, will continue the unrelenting struggle against American imperialism, Soviet social-imperialism and their satellites. We shall be in complete unity with all those who apply the principles of Marxism-Leninism consistently and correctly.

With the letter which the Central Committee of our Party sent to the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, in which it expressed the opinion that Nixon should not be received in Peking (and although up till now they have said nothing about this opinion, we understand that the Chinese comrades are not pleased about this), we demonstrated the consistency of our struggle. As a result of our efforts one of the obstacles, which had been placed by the United States of America, which was

not in agreement that the PR of China should be admitted to the United Nations Organization, was removed. However, with the admission of China to this Organization, this obstacle was eliminated. Thus the way has been opened for the United States of America to be forced to recognize the Government of the PR of China and clear up the question of Taiwan before Nixon goes to China. Hence, we fought to ensure that the injustice done to China was put in order, not with bargaining but with struggle, not because the United States of America wanted this, but contrary to its desire.

The Chinese comrades must not forget or underestimate this, and this ought to make them recognize their great mistake and feel ashamed that they are not going to send a delegation to the 6th Congress of our Party, the Party which has always been beside them in the most difficult moments of their existence. But after all, we only did our duty as a Marxist-Leninist Party and socialist state.

TUESDAY
OCTOBER 26, 1971

OUR CONGRATULATIONS ON THE ADMISSION OF CHINA TO THE UNITED NATIONS ORGANIZATION

We must send our congratulations to China on its admission to the UNO. I told Nesti to go to congratulate the ambassador of China on this occasion and to get his opinion (allegedly so we would not make any mistake) in connection with the telegram which we shall send to Mao, Dung Pi-wu and Chou En-lai, in place of Mao, Lin Piao and Chou En-lai as usual, and he should say, «We are doing this to give importance to the aspect of state relations, too». The Chinese ambassador relieved, replied: «Your idea is very good». Nesti said to him again: «Is it necessary for you to consult Peking on this question?» The ambassador replied: «No, no. What you have thought to do about this matter is very good.» Hence, without their telling us a thing, it is indirectly confirmed that something has occurred with Lin Piao. The rumours which have spread cannot be entirely without foundation. But we shall wait till the Chinese tell us themselves. This matter will come out one day.

We recommended to the comrades that they organize visits by the workers of Tirana to the Chinese Embassy and we must send our congratulations to Peking.

With all our consistent Marxist-Leninist stands in defence of China, and the Communist Party of China, let us tell Peking that they made a great mistake when they did not send a delegation to our 6th Congress.

THURSDAY
OCTOBER 28, 1971

CHOU EN-LAI'S TALKS WITH HENRY KISSINGER

The second round of talks is over. Instead of four days, they went on for six days in the greatest secrecy. The communique is laconic, especially from the Chinese side, a communique which says nothing except that the talks had to do with the journey of the American president to Peking. The whole world knows this.

Meanwhile Kissinger, who has returned to Washington, had his first talks with his president and, according to foreign agencies, declared that **everything went well, the talks about the president's journey to China are in order. This journey will be made in the beginning of 1972 and Kissinger is to go back to Peking to have talks with Chou about this, this time to make preparations for the trip from the technical angle.**

Kissinger, still according to news agencies, has declared that Nixon will talk with Mao and Chou about many problems, but not about the Soviet Union and the question of Vietnam, a thing which «must be discussed with the Vietnamese». Kissinger also said that allegedly he knew nothing about the disagreements in the ranks of the Chinese leadership and this, as he expressed it, did not interest him.

Hence, perhaps we can conclude that Nixon's going to Peking is not encountering any obstacle. And if there were obstacles to this in the ranks of the Chinese leader-

ship, they have now been eliminated by denouncing them as «leftist views». Undoubtedly they have reached agreement over the problems which will be discussed, not just as to the subjects, but also as to the approximate joint solution.

The problem of the admission of China to the United Nations Organization, in which we played an important role, was resolved with struggle, and one year earlier than either Nixon or Chou En-lai expected, as they themselves declared officially, a few days before the final vote was taken at the UNO. That means the number one external obstacle was eliminated. As I recommended to Nesti to note in his speech at the United Nations Organization, «Pontius Pilate» washed his hands of the expulsion of Chiang from this organization. **This opened the way to the overcoming of the second obstacle, the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China. For this a formula acceptable to both sides has to be found — «to cook the stew without burning the pot» — Chiang must continue to live in Formosa and Chou must save his face, because «the talks» (meaning the friendship) with the United States of America remain the pivot of the «new great» strategy of China.**

Agreement on this point may have been reached already in the second round of Chou-Kissinger talks, and the United States of America may need a month or two to convince Chiang to fall into line with this.

It is possible that Kissinger's third visit will bring about the establishment of diplomatic relations between the United States of America and the People's Republic of China. Then everything will go smoothly for Chou. President Nixon will be welcomed with flowers, gongs and portraits in Peking, «a new era will be opened», new accounts will be opened, «the ugly duckling turns into a

beautiful swan», and Chou will say: «We shut the Albanians' mouths over their criticisms about Nixon's visit to Peking, because China has been admitted to the United Nations, because it has been recognized by the United States of America, because the problem of Taiwan has been settled». Now Chou will say to his sincere American friends: Let us talk. But what shall we talk about? About our affairs and those of others, let us develop our friendship, trade, art and culture, let us visit each other without hindrance, talk about Japan, India, Indonesia, Europe, Australia, in a word, about everything «with the exception of the Soviet Union and Vietnam».

However, Chou knows very well that the Albanians do not readily swallow these things. The fact is that the Chinese must have had opposition internally. They are keeping these things secret from us, they are keeping away from us «like the devil from holy water». But however they protect themselves, the day will come when what they are hiding from us will come out openly. **The Chinese ambassador in Hannoi told our ambassador: «We (the Chinese) have made grave mistakes towards the Vietnamese, both the embassy and our army which has worked here. We condemned Vietnamese-American talks in Paris. This was leftist». Of course, this is «leftist» when you yourself are rightist, and when you are rightist and opportunist and revisionist, you begin to attack the Marxist-Leninists as leftists...**

The Titoites and the Rumanians are rejoicing. China is with them, and if not today, tomorrow will fall in line with them quite openly. China will take the «third position», the position of the «third world», the world that Tito calls by another name, the «non-aligned world», of which he wants to be the leader. China will try to balance the American-Soviet power in new spheres of influence which must be wrested from the two of them, but unfortu-

nately, not to the advantage of the revolution. Tito and Ceausescu will try to strengthen the wind which is blowing in China in favour of the United States of America, to the detriment of the Soviets. Let them continue to call it the «East wind», but this East wind carries sleet, rain, revisionism. This will make China begin to increase its credits for the countries of the «third world», begin talks and contacts with the revisionist parties from all over the place; China will abandon the new Marxist-Leninist parties one after the other, pretending that «one bilateral meeting» and one talk are sufficient.

It began this abandonment publicly by its refusal to attend the 6th Congress of our Party, in which representatives of Marxist-Leninist parties and revolutionary groups will take part. Of course the about-turn will be made with nuances, «with reasons», so that it does not resemble that of the Soviet revisionists, that of the Titoites, or that of the Rumanians. **This will have its own Chinese nuances and those of a great state, as well as those of an unconsolidated party with many currents.**

Of course for our Party and the international communist movement the struggle becomes more onerous and difficult. But everything is clear to us, nothing ean deceive us. Our Party has been well-hardened, has overcome many difficulties and obstacles, has fought, and accumulated great experience. We shall stand with our heads high, fighting in defence of the principles of Marxism-Leninism, against any one, even against all, if need be. Marxism-Leninism illuminates our road, it never leads us up a blind alley if we remain loyal to it. And our Party will remain loyal to Marxism-Leninism, to its own people, socialism and communism.

TUESDAY
NOVEMBER 9, 1971

THE CHINESE COMRADES AND THE 6th CONGRESS OF OUR PARTY

The 6th Congress of the Party ended with extraordinary success. This congress displayed the internal unity of the Party and the Party-people unity, displayed the wisdom and maturity of the Party, its courage and unbreakable internationalism.

What was the stand of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China towards this major event for our Party and people? Cold, and I can say, insulting. But we did not show it, although we fully understood what they were up to. We did not adopt their wrong stance, but stood unwavering on our revolutionary Marxist-Leninist line toward the Communist Party of China and the fraternal, friendly Chinese people.

Let the communists throughout the world judge who behaved well and who behaved badly, who showed himself firm on the Marxist-Leninist line, and who has vacillated. **The failure of the leadership of the Communist Party of China to send its delegation to the 6th Congress of our Party is not «because of the decision which they took at their 9th Congress». This is not true, it is patently a lie. A congress which respects the teachings of Marx and Lenin cannot take such a decision. Such a decision would be anti-Marxist. We know that the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China did not take this decision**

and the Chinese leadership, which is lying, shows itself to be anti-Marxist twice over, towards its own congress and towards us. It could occur, in certain circumstances and instances, that the central committee of a party takes such a decision, and this action would not be wrong, but this decision can never be permanent and never adopted by the congress.

Hence, the decision not to send a delegation of the CP of China to the 6th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania was taken by Mao and Chou En-lai because of opposition to our Party over line. What is the basis of this opposition? This we have told them openly, like bolsheviks. They do not speak about this, but gather up and distort what we say and then come out with non-Marxist public stands and reasons.

The fact is that they have lined themselves up with the revisionists, on a course towards conciliation and contacts with the revisionist parties of the world. Hence, for «political» expediency they have begun to adopt a two-faced stand, they have their hearts over there, while they have their stereotyped formulas, their posters for the gallery, because they still need them, here. It is understandable that Marxism-Leninism quickly shows up the trickery of opportunists who use phoney disguises.

Apart from the fact that they did not send a delegation, the attitude of the Chinese leadership towards our 6th Congress is also reflected in the press and in the radio, and here it has been like a «faded poster» to get by the difficulty and just to observe the formalities.

Their greeting sent to the 6th Congress of our Party was the usual thing which could have been sent to any kind of party, full of stereotyped phrases, which the Chinese use constantly. It was not signed by Mao, as on other occasions, «because it was beneath his dignity». During the proceedings of the 6th Congress, they wrote

nothing about it, but an article of «Zëri i popullit» was reprinted in «Renmin Ribao», and a report by Chinese journalists who were at the congress, which could be described as a chronicle without any value, was published. And in order to show that they were interested, in the newspapers they began their Chinese tricks about the «olives of friendship», the «Albanian wheat», and other such things which do not go down.

The greeting on the 30th anniversary of the founding of our Party was simply the greeting which they sent to the 6th Congress with a few stereotyped formulas added or removed. This, too, was spiritless, like the anonymous greeting they sent us on the occasion of the election of the new Central Committee of our Party. They say that they have held a solemn meeting in Peking on this occasion; we have no information about it, but we can guess what it was like.

This is the «entire effort» that the comrades of the Chinese leadership made about the 6th Congress of our heroic Party which, when the Communist Party of China and China itself were under furious attack by everybody, from all sides, defended them with Marxist-Leninist determination. Only the Party of Labour of Albania, only socialist Albania stood beside them, and with continuous, consistent, principled, stern Marxist-Leninist struggle, defended the Communist Party of China and the triumphs of People's China. **We did our duty as internationalists and as their firm friends. History will judge us in the future as it does now and will always consider that right is on the side of the Party of Labour of Albania and the People's Republic of Albania.**

The Chinese leadership thinks that «now they are over the river they have no further need for the horse». But through all the centuries of our history, we Albanians have not carried anyone on our backs, have never tolerated

such a thing, but those who have had such ideas have taken such a beating from the Albanians that they never forget, however many centuries go by and however the circumstances change. Friendship on a Marxist-Leninist internationalist basis is sacred to us Albanians, as a people and as Marxists, and we have fought and will fight for this, courageously and persistently. We shall struggle for true Marxist-Leninist friendship with the Communist Party of China and the Chinese people, a friendship which is sacred to us, and we shall be prudent, mature, and patient, **but we shall defend the Marxist-Leninist principles of our Party, as we defend our lives, and will fight all those, whoever they may be, who seek to distort and attack them.**

WEDNESDAY
NOVEMBER 10, 1971

«SOMETHING» SENSATIONAL

A radiogram from Peking informs us that a Chinese told a comrade of ours: «In ten days' time you will hear something very sensational». Ten days went by, and the same person said: «A major split has taken place in the main leadership of China, and measures have been taken against those who said one thing in the Cultural Revolution, and acted differently. Lin Piao is at the head of them».

THURSDAY
NOVEMBER 11, 1971

CHOU EN-LAI LEADS THE ARMY, TOO

The Chinese leadership is saying nothing about what is going on, but people are beginning «to speak off their own bat».

The Chinese drivers of the Embassy of the People's Republic of Albania in Peking tell our comrades: «Although Chou En-lai has been very tired, now he seems more rested **and is leading the army, too**».

Hence, you can take it that Lin Piao has been dismissed!

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 15, 1971

NOTES ABOUT CHINA

We must consider the publication of the Report submitted to the 6th Congress and its discussion among the masses of the party and people in China a very great success for our Party and its Marxist-Leninist line.

Undoubtedly China is now going through a moment of grave internal crisis, and especially a crisis in the main leadership of the party. We know nothing officially, they are telling us nothing about «the struggle against leftism», the «fall of Lin Piao», etc. But there is no doubt that something grave is occurring there.

Who are these «leftists»? What are they accused of and by whom? All these things cannot be kept secret for ever. The fact is that in this grave situation the report delivered at the 6th Congress of our Party was given to the Chinese party and people «to study it, and draw lessons from it». This rejoices us.

The revisionists and opportunists can say and do anything, but the impressions about our Party and people amongst the Chinese communists and the Chinese people are deep and cannot be wiped out with slanders. Through its policy, our Party must do everything in its power to influence China and the Communist Party of China with its correct line, on the Marxist-Leninist road.

We must never forget that this is our greatest duty in the international field. We are in stern and merciless

struggle with imperialism, revisionism and reaction. **Which will triumph in China? Reaction or socialism, revisionism or Marxism-Leninism?** We shall struggle to ensure that Marxism-Leninism triumphs.

Socialist Albania may appear small as a state, but Marxism-Leninism, under the banner of which it is fighting, is colossal. Therefore, on any question which has to do with China, I tell the comrades continually: we must never forget this great aim, this colossally great task on the international scale, in favour of the world revolution.

FRIDAY
NOVEMBER 19, 1971

CARRILLO IN CHINA

The Hsinhua news agency reported that a delegation of the Spanish revisionist party of Passionaria, headed by the general secretary Carrillo arrived in China and visited many of its cities. It reported that a banquet given for the delegation passed in a cordial atmosphere, and Keng Biao, Director of the Foreign Directory of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China, held talks with the delegation at which the opinions of the two sides were presented.

Now it is clear that the Communist Party of China began the contacts, the talks and, why not, even the agreements. For the time being, perhaps these may be on certain problems, until they reach agreement on everything. After this meeting comes the turn of meetings with other revisionist parties, the Italian, French, British, Dutch, etc. This is a whole process in development.

On the one hand, the Communist Party of China is following the most openly opportunist road, allegedly maintains bilateral contacts with the communist and workers' parties (Marxist-Leninist) «just to listen to them and to be informed» but without assisting them, in particular, without supporting them ideologically in the struggle against revisionist parties and against other groups of anarchists and Trotskyites, while on the other hand, the

Communist Party of China has begun and will continue to develop contacts and come to terms with the revisionist parties. This line, naturally, will take them deep into the mire of revisionist ideology, will take them ideologically into the «third world», that is, to the revisionist course of Tito, Ceausescu, Castro, etc.

The other course which the Communist Party of China is pursuing is allegedly that of state relations in order to strengthen contacts with the revisionist parties in the countries where they are in power and which have contradictions with the Soviet Union and the revisionist party of the Soviet Union. **At the same time, despite all these things it is doing, and precisely in order to disguise the true tactical and strategic aims of these revisionist and opportunist activities, the Communist Party of China «maintains relations» and proclaims to the world and trumpets that «it is on the same line and in complete Marxist-Leninist unity with the Party of Labour of Albania» and by supporting us implies, that «we, too, are allegedly in agreement with many of its activities». This is a very cunning tactic.**

The fact that one of the reasons they gave us for not coming to our 6th Congress was «the large participation of the Marxist-Leninist parties», proves this very clearly. The telegram which they sent us for the Congress, as well as for the 30th anniversary of the founding of the Party, lauded to the skies this internationalism of our Party and the support we give to the Marxist-Leninist parties. But as soon as this Congress was over, they issued a communique which welcomed Carrillo of Ibarruri, who, when we defended Marxism-Leninism and attacked Soviet revisionism and Khrushchev at the Moscow Meeting, called us «Trotskyites».

The revisionist group of Carrillo and the socialist group of Pietro Nenni are welcomed openly in China and joint

communiques are published immediately, whereas Chou En-lai barely gave the delegation of the Communist Party of Poland (Marxist-Leninist), which went to China much before these others, an hour of his time, while the joint communique which the Chinese themselves proposed and which they agreed to publish, they did not publish at all. Apart from their lack of sincerity, this also demonstrates what I said above: the Chinese are sacrificing the Communist Party of Poland (Marxist-Leninist) in order to link up with the revisionist party of Gierek and the Polish state, allegedly because they have contradictions with the Soviet Union and the Communist Party of the Soviet Union.

The welcoming of the revisionist group of Carrillo to Peking will damage and raise many obstacles for the Communist Party of Spain (Marxist-Leninist), which is new. This will hinder it in the development and further consolidation of its positions. At the same time, such a thing will compel the Communist Party of Spain (Marxist-Leninist) to take a stand, either within the party, or in its propaganda, about the relations of the Communist Party of China with the revisionist party of Passionaria, because, in its press, the revisionist party of Spain will make the most of this success which it has scored in China. Undoubtedly it will say on this occasion, that «a bridge has been built to unity of the communist movement»; that «there are no fundamental disagreements between it and the Communist Party of China»; that «those few things which divide them were put aside and those which unite them were made the basis of their Marxist-Leninist collaboration»; that «it was decided there should be no polemics between our two parties», and all the usual revisionist rubbish will follow in due course.

Although the communique issued by Peking does not say these things, it implies them. The Chinese communi-

que says only that the two sides put forward their views. It is natural that their views should be put forward, but what are these views? Where are you and where are you not in agreement?! It is supposed that they were in agreement, and if there were some things on which they were not in agreement, they were so unimportant that it was unnecessary to point them out. Thus, Carillo and Passionaria wrapped things up very well.

The very same situation will be created for all the (Marxist-Leninist) communist parties when delegations from the revisionist parties of their countries go to China.

Hence, a new concrete danger threatens to undermine the new Marxist-Leninist parties in particular, which have still not strengthened and consolidated themselves internally. This of course, is a great danger for the international communist movement in the first place, therefore, the burden falls on our Party, in particular, in cooperation and unity with the other Marxist-Leninist parties, to neutralize this danger and to triumph over it.

We shall fight to defend our principles, to defend Marxism-Leninism, to defend the sister Marxist-Leninist parties, which must be conscious of the danger, must be vigilant, cautious, principled and revolutionary, must strengthen themselves internally organizationally, ideologically and politically; they must safeguard the Marxist-Leninist unity within the party, because in this situation, and especially when the parties are untempered, this unity is always in danger.

MONDAY
NOVEMBER 22, 1971

CHINA, VIETNAM AND THE SECRET NEGOTIATIONS WITH THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

In this direction we have to make suppositions about everything, have to work with imagination, making deductions from a few laconic news items from foreign agencies, from some statements of Nixon, from some journeys by North Vietnamese leaders and an occasional Chinese communique which, in fact, says nothing.

The Chinese are telling us nothing, not just about their negotiations with the USA, but about any of their political activity in the international arena. We have to use our imagination to work out the Chinese «puzzle» of their foreign policy for ourselves. The question is frequently complicated and since we do not have accurate data, it is possible that sometimes we are wrong.

Hence, from the development of events and the facts we have, I think that the Vietnamese-American conference in Paris, in which the North Vietnamese had placed hopes of a «political victory», has gone into deep sleep, and from Paris it is being transferred to Peking, and from legal it has now become clandestine.

From the time it was announced that Nixon was to go to meet Mao Tsetung in Peking, the fire went out in Paris and the smoke from it came out in China. Apparently, this cold shower was poured on this conference

without consultation with and without the approval of the Vietnamese who were very angry and allowed their anger with the Chinese to show clearly.

The Vietnamese, it seems, did not like such a thing to be done without asking them, to be done over their heads, behind their backs and surreptitiously, especially, because «when the issue is about Vietnam, they alone decide». According to the Vietnamese, the Chinese aid in this direction is second-rate, and not the one and only aid, but the Soviet aid must be parallel with it, at the same or a higher level. Therefore, the Vietnamese want to have not one, but two equally reliable supporters, who should be their own and the Americans' friends.

The Chinese, it seems, were obliged «to lower their colours» to the Vietnamese and «to correct their mistakes», because during this time «grave things in the leadership» occurred in China which entangled Chou's feet, but at the same time gave him a hand to throw all the blame for the so-called mistakes towards Vietnam on «the ultra-leftists, the plotters».

Li Hsien-nien was hastily dispatched to Hanoi before Podgorny went there. Li Hsien-nien made a self-criticism and went loaded with aid and assurances that they would talk about Vietnam with the Americans the way the Vietnamese ordered. This satisfied the Vietnamese and their Soviet friends, who, as initiators and zealous proponents of the treacherous compromise with the Americans to extinguish the war in Vietnam, did not stay out of this game that was being played at the expense of the people of Vietnam.

Thus, according to these facts, we are forced to the conclusion that these matters will be discussed with Nixon not only in Peking, but also in Moscow. **Nixon has two horses in his team for his course of the war in Vietnam. If one goes «lame», the other pulls the chariot of American imperialism.**

After this situation had been set up behind the scenes, the bargaining began. It is said that when Kissinger, Nixon's envoy, was in Peking for the second time, the North Vietnamese Le Duc Tho went there, too. It is said, also, that a meeting was held between Kissinger and Le Duc Tho in great secrecy and under the patronage of Chou En-lai. It is not known what was decided.

Now, Nixon has declared at a recent press conference that «he would withdraw a contingent of troops» from Vietnam. Of course, this is «the sprat to catsh the mackerel» and is linked with the secret negotiations: you concede to me and I concede to you; the more you concede, the more I concede. At this time, a military coup d'état took place in Thailand, dominated by the Americans. A «marshal» became prime minister and ten generals members of the government, all of them agents of the Pentagon. Therefore, «if we reach a compromise in Vietnam», says Nixon, «we shall continue the war in Cambodia and Laos, with reliable bases in Thailand».

In this «brilliant» situation which the policy of compromise and the policy of the Soviet and Chinese revisionists opened to Vietnam, Pham Van Dong went to Peking this week. Why has he gone? We do not know, but we can guess.

In the joint communique with Pham Van Dong, apparently to placate the Vietnamese, to reassure the Soviets and say to the Americans, «we can do no more than this with the Vietnamese», Chou En-lai declared «the Vietnamese themselves decide their own fate».

It seems, another meeting with Kissinger in Peking is in the «air» allegedly to arrange «Nixon's journey» from the technical aspect, a journey which the news agencies forecast for March or April. Hence, plenty of time for trickery and compromises.

We understood all these things. Now, as always, the duty falls on us to follow events continuously, to study them, to draw deductions for ourselves, and to build our line and stands, because no one among them tells us anything, and especially anything true.

TUESDAY
DECEMBER 28, 1971

MASS AMERICAN BOMBING OF NORTH VIETNAM

For six or seven days on end, American aircraft have been furiously bombing North Vietnam — radar stations, aerodromes, and villages (250 incursions per day). The bombing has reached the outskirts of Hanoi, but the city itself has still not been attacked. Vietnam radio reports deaths among the people, while the American command in Saigon says the bombing is being carried out on the order of President Nixon himself.

Nixon and American imperialism will never give up agression or stop the bombing of Vietnam if their hands are not cut off. A great tragedy is being played in Vietnam, and it goes beyond the borders of that country. The Vietnamese are stepping up the war which they had somewhat dampened down, because of «the great policy» which they were carrying out in the meetings in Paris. However, the meetings in Paris yielded no fruit.

Nixon's going to Peking was being prepared secretly. This «bomb» was dropped, and the Vietnamese, like us, had apparently not been consulted, therefore they were displeased and there were some internal rumblings. We read solemn declarations on the part of China that the question of Vietnam would not be discussed with Nixon. We followed the comings and goings of Chinese and Vietnamese delegations to Hanoi and Peking; declarations were issued and speeches delivered: «China is always the

base area of Vietnam», «China thinks that Vietnam itself must decide its own fate», etc.

On the other hand, Kissinger goes to China for the second time, holds long talks with Chou, and makes solemn declarations that «in the talks with Nixon, third countries will not be discussed». In other words, Chou En-lai, through the mouth of Kissinger, says publicly (because the Chinese, for their part, are not saying anything about what they discuss with the Americans) that they are not concerned about the problem of the Americans' war in Vietnam. The Chinese may deny it, and have to disclaim such a thing absolutely, but this is how it turns out. This is becoming very dangerous for the Chinese.

Hence, the present situation is like this: on the one hand, the official American delegations come and go to Peking and in peace, friendship, with mutual goodwill, prepare the journey of President Nixon down to the finest details; and on the other hand, hundreds and thousands of American bombers fly each day over North Vietnam, unload their bombs, and kill the people in the name of that rabid criminal president who will be welcomed with flowers and with crowds in Peking.

This is a political crime, this is scandal such as has never been seen or heard of before. Peking writes an occasional article, but this has no more value than the «fiery anti-American» articles of «Pravda». Demagogy!!

Peking is not making even the minimum gesture to react to the American bombing of North Vietnam and at least cancel the reception of Nixon in Peking, making the cessation of the bombing a condition for this visit. But it is not easy for Peking to carry out even this political act. Nixon has them by the throat and is blackmailing them.

The Chinese have made a public commitment that

they will not discuss the question of Vietnam when Nixon goes to Peking. This is one thing, **but the biggest thing is Nixon's going to Peking itself, the question of the Chinese policy, and the new Chinese strategy. There was an internal reaction over this. Such a thing brought them big problems and therefore, radical measures were taken and a purge carried out. Now they cannot retreat, because the retreat has catastrophic consequences for the politicians who built the new strategy. And Nixon, the Soviets, the Vietnamese, and the whole world are well aware of this.**

The results: the Vietnamese will continue their attacks (indirectly, the Vietnamese are killing two birds with one stone, they also put the Chinese, who will welcome Nixon, in difficulties). Nixon savagely bombs Vietnam and prepares to go to China, alienates China from the Vietnamese people, discredits its prestige, and plays the game of the Soviets, with whom he is in agreement.

The Soviets expose the Chinese for their «duet» with the Americans at a time when Vietnam is being bombed. But the Khrushchevite clique also «exposes» the Americans, «supports» its Vietnamese revisionist friends and it is possible that, when Nixon has consummated his visit to China, the Soviets will cancel his visit to Moscow, because of the bombing of Vietnam. All this to unmask China in the eyes of the world for welcoming Nixon at a time when Vietnam is being bombed, while they create the impression in regard to themselves that, «we, the Soviets, refuse to allow Nixon to come to Moscow as we refused Eisenhower after the U-2 incident»!!

This is a cunning and very dangerous game which the Soviets and the Americans may be playing. In some way, we must introduce this idea into the ears of the Chinese. Perhaps the Chinese foresee such a thing, perhaps they dismiss this eventuality, in order to deceive themselves

that the Soviets are not doing this, that they are afraid lest the United States and China... etc.

All these are day dreams in order to justify the weakness that «you, China can never get out of this impasse», but it must get out of it, because otherwise it will be disgraced.

THURSDAY
DECEMBER 30, 1971

THE INDIAN-PAKISTANI WAR AND CHINA

The peoples of India and Pakistan are suffering and will continue to suffer under British imperialist policy, the savage oppression of the local capitalist bourgeoisie, and the imperialist intrigues of the Soviet revisionists and the United States of America.

British imperialism allegedly gave India its freedom, but in fact, for its own interests, it created the state of India and that of Pakistan in an artificial way. Pakistan was created on the basis of the Moslem religion, and its state territory was divided into two parts: East and West Pakistan, separated from each other by almost a whole continent, by India, comprised of many peoples of different religious beliefs.

Of course, the existence of the state of Pakistan was imposed on India, because it wanted to gobble up the whole territory under the domination of the maharajahs, but since it was impossible to achieve this aim, it contented itself with the annexation of Kashmir, which, if we accept the religious division and other traditions, belonged to Pakistan. The latter, understandably, never accepted this unjust solution of British imperialism in favour of India.

Therefore, during the whole of their «free and independent» existence, these two bourgeois capitalist states remained at daggers drawn. British imperialism had major interests in the two «free and independent» states, and

therefore continued to develop its relations with them in its own interest, without the form of «viceroy», made the law there, and these countries were part of the British Commonwealth, the sterling area, etc. And the cadres of the state and the army, both of India and Pakistan, were trained and educated in Britain.

These two «free» countries lived under the savage domination of feudal maharajahs and big capitalists, supported by the City of London. **The Indian and Pakistani people suffered under double mediaeval bondage; the poverty, hunger and disease there were beyond description. From every viewpoint, the Indians and the Pakistanis are among the poorest peoples of the world.** Even to this day they are still in this situation, regardless of the publicity which the world capitalist bourgeoisie tries to make about the two governments of India and Pakistan. Jinnah, the Agha Khan and the other khans, on the part of Pakistan, Gandhi, Nehru, Shastri or Indira Gandhi, and the other maharajahs of India, those who go about naked, keeping a goat at hand, or those who ride on jewel-encrusted elephants, all these had, and still have their feet on the necks of the people of Pakistan and India.

Both these countries, with large populations and major importance in world political spheres, developed in the bourgeois capitalist framework. The different imperialist states, first of all Britain and the United States of America, and now the Soviet revisionists, have used these states in the interests of their policy of world hegemony. These two allegedly independent states have sometimes carried out the policy of Britain, sometimes that of the United States of America, since they are linked with them in aggressive military treaties. For example, Pakistan is linked with them through CENTO, whereas the Nehru government, as a champion of the «third bloc», managed to get billions of dollars in credits from the United States

of America, and indeed to carry out its policy by committing armed provocations against China and turned to an open friendship with the Khrushchevites. Now Indira Gandhi has gone so far as to conclude a military pact with the Soviet Union.

American imperialism replaced British imperialism in these countries, and for years on end, strove to make the influence of American monopolies and the Pentagon predominant. The United States of America aims to have all this zone under its influence in order to strengthen its imperialism in Asia and in the Far East and, especially, to prepare the military encirclement of and aggression against the People's Republic of China and other peoples of Asia. American imperialism, openly at war with the peoples of Vietnam, incited India against China, and not only that. It also fanned up the flames of the Indian-Pakistani hostility in order to keep these two states at its mercy in this way, and then to interfere more easily in their internal affairs, etc.

So far Pakistan and India have engaged in armed clashes with each other on three occasions over territorial issues and have been continually «aided» with arms and with «advice» to kill each other, to arrange a cease-fire, and then to kill each other again. The Krushchevites also, took a hand in this dirty imperialist game, openly taking the side of reactionary and aggressive India, and now having concluded a treaty with it, they are inciting the Indians against Pakistan.

The current conflict between India and Pakistan is not aimed only at the settlement of disagreements between the two states by means of war, but at the same time has a wider aggressive strategic character, because the Soviet Union and the United States of America are implicated in it in open and in «less open» ways.

India is the aggressor. There is no doubt about this,

and it is not even bothering to disguise such a thing. India launched the first attack on the borders of East Pakistan and interfered in the internal affairs of another state. The pretext was prepared and found: the question of Bangladesh and Bengal.

As is known, in East Pakistan elections were held in the way they are done in the countries where the military dictatorships of feudal lords predominate. The way such elections are conducted and end up is the same both in India and Pakistan. Thus, in Pakistan, the party of Mujibar Rahman in Bangladesh won the majority in Parliament. Naturally, President Yahya Khan took measures, because Mujibar Rahman proclaimed the «Free People's Republic of Bengal» with the aim of breaking away from Pakistan. Rahman was arrested and everything was annulled.

India, which had a hand in this plot, urged and supported by the Soviets, with which it had signed the treaty only a few weeks before, gave the order and thus the emigration of the Bengalis to India began. They say that ten million refugees went there. For about a month they publicized this mass displacement of the population, stressing the «barbarities» of the Pakistani Khans, and after the terrain was prepared, the Indians unleashed their armies «to defend the rights of the Bengalis», «to defend the Republic of Bengal», and in order to somehow justify this from the official angle, recognized the Indian-sponsored quisling government while proclaiming Bangladesh a «Republic».

The tactic of the Indians is known. The Dalai Lama fled Tibet together with a handful of kulaks and feudal lords. The Indian Government gathered up all Tibetan fugitives everywhere in India, organized them around the Dalai Lama, and began to beat the drum against the People's Republic of China. This was the preparation of

the terrain for the armed aggression which it undertook against China, but which was struck a crushing blow by the army of Mao Tsetung. At that time, Khrushchev maintained a stand openly against China and defended the Indian aggressors. And this time, too, the Soviet revisionists are maintaining the same stand. In the Indian-Pakistani conflict, also, they openly take the side of India, the aggressor. Their alleged explanation for this is that they are allies with India, that India is a «progressive, peaceful» and «socialist» state, and even go so far as to say that India «is defending the freedom and independence of oppressed peoples», etc. Hence, the Soviet Union «is defending the peoples' national liberation wars», «the freedom and independence of the peoples». These are the demagogic tales they spread. Such is their treachery and this clearly exposes the aims of the Soviet revisionists and Soviet social-imperialism.

The Soviet-American-Indian plan is deeper. Their aim is to discredit China politically and to involve it in their major international intrigues and, finally, to provoke it into becoming involved in an armed conflict.

The fact is that the People's Republic of China has friendly relations with Pakistan, gives it economic credits, assists it with armaments, is linked with it by a strategic road through the Himalayas, a road which has great importance for China and for Pakistan. Thus, against the hostile, provocative and anti-Chinese policy of the Indian Government, the friendship of China with Pakistan is a good, positive and progressive thing, irrespective of the form of the regime which exists there. In India, Afghanistan, Indonesia and elsewhere, besides the fact that the regimes are like that of Pakistan or even worse, they are also all extremely active against China.

It is natural that China should be on the side of Pakistan in the current conflict, not only because friendly

relations exist between them, but also because India is the aggressor that has interfered in the internal affairs of another free and independent state. Therefore China's stand in the conflict referred to is correct.

China ought to give Pakistan powerful assistance from the political and diplomatic angle. We shall be shoulder to shoulder with it, because we must unmask the aggression and the local and international plot of India, the Soviet Union and the United States of America. China has supplied the Pakistanis with arms, and possibly may supply them with more, if they ask for this. In my opinion, China could do this, but, as to becoming involved in this armed conflict itself, such a thing it must not do. China must guard against this provocation, because the main aim of the Soviets, the Americans and the Indians is precisely to involve China in the war so that the «ring of fire» built up around it bursts into flames.

If the provocation takes place, it will be caused by India, precisely where the fighting took place during the first provocation. The immediate objective will be Tibet, but this will be accompanied by Soviet provocations along the Sino-Soviet border, where the Soviet revisionists have massed one and a half million soldiers, according to Chinese figures. The Soviets know the internal situation in China, the measures which have been taken against Lin Piao and other marshals (about which we know nothing officially), and the danger exists that they will create a grave and difficult situation on the borders of China. Therefore, the Communist Party of China must be extremely vigilant, must fight as quickly and effectively as possible for the Marxist-Leninist unity of the party and of the party with the people, as well as for the compactness of the army. A liberal, let alone revisionist policy, in the current conditions in China, will have grave and irreparable consequences.

The Soviet revisionists have committed themselves to a bloc with India, hence against China in the first place, but they are also exerting a degree of serious pressure on the American influence on this subcontinent. The Pakistani-Indian war is the political and ideological preparation and, later perhaps, the armed preparation for the Sino-Soviet conflict.

In this conflict, American imperialism is playing a «moderating», «peace-making» role and appears as if it is against India and pro Pakistan, but not committed to either side. It poses as if it has planned a «peaceful strategy», «negotiations and understanding with China», «negotiations and understanding with the Soviet Union», as if it is making efforts for a gradual withdrawal from Vietnam, while the war continues and the United States of America is pleased with this new conflict in Asia, because it draws the attention of the world away from Vietnam and damages its opponents: China and the Soviets. The Americans are struggling for such a thing, that is, the exacerbation of the contradictions between China and the Soviet Union to the point of war.

Now the United States of America «is holding the balance» in policy and in this conflict between China and the Soviet Union, between Pakistan and India. Meanwhile the propaganda of the Soviet revisionists is hammering out that in this conflict China is moving closer to the United States of America.

Hence, China together with the «third world», as China's official delegation to the UNO declared, is opposed to a member of this «world», India, which, as is known, is one of the states which «lead» the «third world». Tito, also a leader of the «third world» is taking the side of India, and this time «apparently» against the United States of America, but in fact against China and pro the

Soviets, who through the Bulgarians can create a quisling Macedonian government, like that of Bangladesh, whenever they like, and attack Yugoslavia. Apparently, the traitor Tito has become senile or, as an agent of the Americans, is to be inside the Indian-Soviet fold to watch and spy.

In any case, China must display very great caution in the international arena and internally, it must strengthen the Marxist-Leninist positions of the party, its organization, its state power and its army. To what extent has it strengthened these? We cannot pronounce on that.

It is said that the Cultural Revolution has ended, but it turns out that it is not over. It is said that it liquidated the group of Liu Shao-chi, but it is also said that during this revolution grave sectarian mistakes were made. What were these sectarian mistakes?! In what directions?! Who made them?! We know nothing. It was said that the party was re-organized, that the revolutionary committees were set up, that the crooks had been purged, and the deputies elected to the Assembly at which the new government was to be formed and a new Constitution decided. When, boom! another big bomb went off unexpectedly and wiped out the greater part of the Political Bureau, with Lin Piao and the top officers at the head. But who knows how many hundreds of thousands are behind them, how many things must be changed, how many people must be replaced, how many there are dissatisfied, unconvinced, unclear! Everything is procceding, but how is it proceeding?! This is the problem, this is a great problem among great problems.

The markedly liberal-opportunist Chinese policy of recent times was undertaken by the group of Chou En-lai in great euphoria (on the basis of what Chou En-lai said when he informed us of the invitation to Nixon to go to China). However, it could not and did not turn out

like this. It seems as if international events have been arranged to weaken China. Nixon's coming meetings are being propagated by imperialism as «giving hopes for peace» and China is going to these meetings not «internally strong», and not prepared to cope with major problems in the international arena either.

Now that China has become a member of the United Nations Organization and the Security Council, it will have to face up to the problems directly and not indirectly, from outside. China did not expect to be admitted to the UNO this year, and was not prepared. Chou En-lai admitted this with his own mouth. The United States of America suffered a defeat. It seemed that such a thing came as a surprise to it too, something it had not reckoned with, or it implied as much. But could this have been so? Could it not have been something prepared by the Americans and the Soviets, to put China immediately into an impasse, because as soon as it entered the UNO, the Indian-Pakistani conflict began, in which China may not be directly implicated, but is committed to Pakistan over all those things which we stated.

The imperialists and revisionists are putting pressure on China, on the one hand, they are threatening it with provocations, with war, and on the other hand, coming out with «olive branches», with proposals of «talks», of «clearing things up». Both of them will keep their finger on the internal pulse of China, both of them will work, will provoke, will make promises and threats, will smile for their individual interests and for their common counterrevolutionary interests.

If that sound, strong, clear, Marxist-Leninist situation which we spoke of does not exist and is not created in China, there are great dangers there. Only great political and ideological clarity, iron organization, a Marxist-

Leninist policy and a steel-like unity can withstand internal and external dangers.

Of course, the Soviets and Americans will act and react on the basis of the actions and reactions of China. If China resists these two savage enemies of socialism, communism and the peoples as it should, then we shall see substantial changes in the tactics and strategy of the two imperialist powers. China must not leave them with even the smallest illusion, must not make them even the slightest political concession. In this case, the United States of America cannot remain idle, and content itself with dreams, while the Soviets make India a second Egypt and the Indian Ocean an ocean for their fleet. China must encourage and deepen the American-Soviet contradictions, and the United States of America must not be allowed to encourage and exploit the Soviet-China contradictions.

The worst of it is that we do not have the chance to talk oyer and discuss these ideas which we have about these international problems with the Chinese comrades. If you talk to their ambassador here, or anyone else, apart from Chou En-lai, they simply note what you say and do not express a single thought of their own. However, even though things are like this, I shall find the occasion to tell them of our views.

Another difficulty is that we do not really know the internal situation of China, we know it only at the propaganda level. But what can we do?

A third difficulty is the problem of the Chinese course towards the United States of America. Our stand towards this problem over which we are not of the same opinion as they has not changed and neither has theirs. They have not made the slightest effort to give us even the briefest reply to the letter we sent them.

1972

MONDAY
JANUARY 3, 1972

WHAT IS GOING ON WITH THE LIN PIAO GROUP?

The Chinese comrades are still not telling us anything in connection with the question of Lin Piao and the other armymen who have disappeared from the scene since September 1971.

The disappearance of Lin Piao from the scene is now an undeniable fact, because many «officiai manifestations» have been held in China without him attending and it has been confirmed that he is no longer in the leadership. As is known, there is a great deal of speculation in the world on this question, but Peking is neither admitting nor denying anything. The Chinese are saying nothing, but only imply, «these are our internal matters of no interest to foreigners». **This may be correct in principle to some degree and for a certain time, but on such a major question, when the whole head of the army is lopped off, when so many months are going by and when all the interest of world opinion is centred on this Chinese problem, something should be done to stop the speculation. Let people hear what has occurred and put their minds at rest. In any case, the friends of China should not be left in the dark to guess at what is going on.**

On this problem, an impermissible silence is being maintained towards us and even if they inform us indirectly, this is an unfriendly, irresponsible, and non-serious method: Tell them and don't tell them! Up til now it is

the Chinese drivers or the Chinese interpreters at our embassy, «party members», who give us «official» versions of what has happened, versions which vary. They all say to us: «What we are telling you, they have told us in the Party and have advised us not to tell anybody, but you are our loyal friends. We believe that your ambassador knows about it; but please keep it secret in any case».

Then should we suppose that these people who come and tell us are sent by the leadership, or do they take the initative themselves, considering us their closest friends and supposing that we have been informed? However, up till now we must say that the Chinese are fanatical about keeping secrets.

What they tell us is important! They claim, and we believe them, that the things they tell us have been raised in the party, and they do not know more than what they tell us, or we must suppose that they have been told, «Tell the Albanians so much and no more».

The essence of what they say is the same in general, but between versions there are differences and contradictions, obscure things, things with double meanings, in a word, these are Chinese tricks.

All versions say that a «dangerous plot has been organized in the leadership by the armymen headed by Lin Piao».

The driver tells us, «After having attempted unsuccessfully to kill Mao, because they were against him, Lin Piao and his wife, together with the other conspirators, seized an aircraft and started to flee to the Soviet Union, but were discovered at the border where the aircraft was hit and shot down in flames in the Mongolia of Tsendenbal». This version is similar to that of the Western agencies, although this driver, a «party member», claims that they told them such a thing in

the party and instructed them not to tell it to foreigners.

But the most reliable version, which we must consider semi-official, concocted for our benefit, is that of the Chinese translator of the press office of our embassy (appointed by the Chinese Foreign Ministry), who, we are certain, is a member of the Communist Party of China. He tells us that, **«Lin Piao fought hard against Mao, Chen Yi, Kang Sheng, Chou En-lai and others. At the plenum of September 1970 many of his mistakes were pointed out to Lin Piao, but he arrogantly refused to admit them and charged many old cadres with the allegation that they are not loyal to Mao Tsetung. In the period August-September 1971, Chairman Mao was on a visit to the South. Lin Piao and his agents charged an army commander with the task of murdering Mao Tsetung during his return from Shanghai, and then of accusing Chang Chun-chiao as a conspirator.**

According to the conspirators' order, an old officer had been charged with placing mines on a bridge between Shangai and Nanking, where the train was to pass. However, Chairman Mao returned to Peking earlier than expected, and the officer himself, who loved Chairman Mao, pretended to be sick and thus the plot failed. At this time, Lin Piao and his group were allegedly on holiday at Bei Ta-he, but he had given orders that the fleet, the border ports and military units should be in readiness to take power after Mao Tsetung had been killed in Shanghai and Chou En-lai in Peking. When the plot was discovered, upon Mao's orders the border was sealed and a state of military alert proclaimed. An aircraft with secret documents on nuclear weapons was captured before it took off from the airport. Thus the attempt to flee failed, too».

When our comrade asked this interpreter what has became of Lin Piao, whom news agencies say has been killed, he replied: **«We know nothing. This is all they**

have told us». Then he continued, «Wu Fa-hsien, Marshal of the Air Force, was bad, because he had left the command of the airforce in the hands of Lin Piao's twenty-four year old son. Lin Piao's wife, Ye Chun, whom Lin had made a member of the Political Bureau, was a foreign spy, possibly for the Soviets. Lin Piao regarded Mao and Chu Teh with contempt and considered the latter stupid. He was a type who sang the praises of Mao, but secretly plotted against him. Mao discovered the plot and now the situation is brilliant, the evil ones have been purged».

It's just like a detective story, with plots, blown-up trains, spies in the service of foreigners, etc., etc.

What can we make of all this? Are these things true? Could all this have been fabricated by people who listen to foreign radios and make up all sorts of versions, or do they send people to tell us those things which they do not inform us of officially?

If we suppose that the latter is the case, we must say that such a stand is not at all correct on the part of the Communist Party of China. These events, as they are related to us, are *rocambolesque** **adventures, intended for naive and absolutely gullible people who do not understand politics at all. If the Chinese leadership really puts these things to the party in this way, as these people tell us, this is simply to impress the members of the party and not to explain the truth to them.**

The way in which the Chinese present the «conspiratorial work of Lin Piao» is not much different from what they communicated to us officially, on the question of Chen Po-ta, in regard to whom, too, they talked about «flattery to Mao on the one hand, and conspiracies behind the scenes, about a sectarian policy against cadres loyal to

---

* Incredible (French in the original.).

Chairman Mao» on the other, and finally they described him as «a spy for foreigners».

As to what the political and ideological opposition of these people to Mao Tsetung consisted of, they are not telling anything to their party, let alone to us, to whom they are saying nothing at all.

Anything is possible, but it takes a bit of swallowing that there could be such leaders, who for years on end had been considered loyal to the policy of Mao Tsetung and to Mao personally, but who one fine morning turned out to be conspirators, who attempted to «blow up the train» in order to kill Mao, to seize power, and take his place.

The question arises: Why should Lin Piao murder Mao and why take his place, when he himself occupied precisely the main position after Mao, was his deputy appointed by the Constitution and by Mao himself? Lin Piao had great renown in China. The Cultural Revolution, «the work of Comrade Mao», had built up his prestige. Then, what occurred for this «mutual political trust and the same ideological conviction» between Mao and Lin Piao to suddenly disappear to the point that the latter organized an attempt on Mao's life? And this act looks like an episode from «James Bond». Since the aim was to seize power, why were such unreliable methods chosen, when they were people intimate with Mao and could more easily liquidate him with other methods? **No, the train had to «be blown up, and Mao personally had to discover the conspiracy and give the order for its liquidation» — all this was necessary «to make an impression on the people».**

Just as in a novel, Mao went from Shanghai to Peking before the «fatal day», the officer who was to lay the mine and who «loved Comrade Mao» pretended to be sick while Lin Piao waited «in a place» for the

result so that he could take power. Swallow this version if you like! Nevertheless, why do they not inform us officially? Of course, they can inform us with «such versions», similar to that about Chen Po-ta, since this is what they have told their party, too, **but I think that somewhere in all this there must be political questions, and this is the nub of the matter. First of all they must have had contradictions over line, debates, opposition. On what were the «ideas of Mao» opposed «by Lin Piao and the leftists»? We are not told this.**

Mao and Chou En-lai constructed a «new strategy» on the occasion of Nixon's going to Peking, and this they told even us, officially. **Were Lin Piao and the «leftists» in agreement with Nixon's visit, were they in agreement with this «new strategy of Mao and Chou»? This they do not tell us, but maintain complete silence about it, indeed, they do not tell even their own people, their own party about it.** Why do they not tell them? Certainly because there is a strong current in the party and the people against Nixon's visit to Peking. **Then, I think, the Chinese leadership wants to get over this period, till Nixon has come and gone, with this version which they have given about the «Lin Piao group». In this way, the attention of the party and the people will be distracted from the political event of Nixon's coming, and they will concentrate on the plot, and afterwards «we shall see what we shall do».** When Nixon leaves Peking and according to the results achieved, new definitive versions can be adopted, then «the situation will be ripe», the investigations will be ended, and one day before the whole world hears the «definitive version of the conspiracy» they will even tell us, Albanians, «their closest comrades-in-arms».

We shall ask the question we have always asked: «Why did these things occur? How did they occur? How were they so slow in learning about such terrible things?».

Of course, we are asking ourselves these questions before the «presentation» which the Chinese comrades might put on for us, «too late to be of any use». This is what occurred with the Liu Shao-chi group, which had been acting openly for years and years on end and which was not disturbed by anyone. The Great Cultural Revolution, the work of Mao Tsetung and effectively led by Chen Po-ta, began. All those things were done, and after all that, they came one morning and told us, «Chen Po-ta was the worst of all, an old agent of the Kuomintang, a spy», etc., etc. On the other hand, Chen Po-ta was an old, well-known cadre, he had even become Mao's secretary, and finally, at the most difficult moments, when the Cultural Revolution broke out, he became a member of the Political Bureau and was one of the main ones, if not the main one, who led the Cultural Revolution.

When the cultural revolution was coming to an end, Chen Po-ta turned out to be a «traitor, enemy, spy, assassin». Then, there emerged the question of Lin Piao, «the deputy of Mao Tsetung and his loyal comrade-in-arms», appointed and consecrated in the party Constitution approved by the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China, a congress which was held 12-13 years after the 8th Congress, and after all those events which had shaken China.

One may well be astonished and ask: How do these things occur and how are they permitted? Does the party act and judge in such important questions, or are rival groups acting there? The Marxist-Leninist logic of our Party cannot consider all these actions in order and correct. It is not a question of our defending Lin Piao and his group, because one must know the naked truth in order to judge. But on the basis of these events, the way they occur, develop, finish up and are resolved, we try to penetrate into certain truths, drawing conclusions and

always bearing in mind the correct line and the Marxist-Leninist policy which a Marxist party ought to follow, in this case, the Communist Party of China.

Who is Lin Piao in fact? For us he is the most unknown person. It is true that he was a commander to whom the liberation of Peking was entrusted. He may have been a fine commander, but nothing else. For the Chinese and for foreigners, the National Liberation Army of China had more outstanding commanders than Lin Piao. He became minister of defence after Peng Ten-huai was removed. Lin Piao remained minister of defence, regardless of the fact that he also became a member of the Political Bureau. But this man raised himself with «crutches», he was inflated «like a balloon» by the others, by Mao, and was «conspicuous» by his absence. All of them came out, directed things, were applauded, while this person remained behind the scenes, invisible, mysterious. **Nothing was said about him except eulogies, but he was neither seen nor known, and nobody talked with him.** The pretext found for this was, «he is sick». **But what sort of sickness was this? The answer was mysterious: «He is allergic to water». But on the other hand, he was the second man in the «hierarchy».**

Our comrades, who have gone one after the other to Peking officially many times (with the exception of myself, who have gone only once, in 1956), have very rarely seen the face of Lin Piao. They have done no more than shake hands with him, and have never had any conversation with him. He did not come out, allegedly because he was sick. Every time they went to China they met and talked with Mao, not to mention Chou En-lai, with whom they talked continually. The only one of the main leaders who works in China was, and still is, Chou En-lai. This is indisputable, irrespective of his views.

But as to what were the views of Lin Piao, we do not know, and we have never heard him express them with his own mouth. Mao, himself, and his comrades have said: «Lin Piao is this and that...», and they will tell us again: «Lin Piao was this and that...». And we have the right to judge on the basis of what they tell us and to say: «But where were you? How do you handle these party affairs? How do you treat these cadres in this way?». It is possible that Lin Piao was nothing much, but was boosted, became conceited, and considered himself to be truly «a great man». Such unprincipled people become dangerous.

In a page of my diary about China, at the time of the Cultural Revolution, at the time of the crisis China was going through, when we were trying to draw conclusions for ourselves in order to maintain correct stands, because at that time, too, like now, the Chinese comrades did not tell us anything, I remember I put up **the hypothesis of a military coup d'état in order to dominate in the party*. I condemned such an action, and it is to be condemned at any time. The army must be a weapon of the dictatorship in the hands of the party, and the party must not become a tool commanded by the army. Anything can happen in a country where the party is not in charge, when it is not strong, monolithic and Marxist-Leninist in principle and in action. We can expect anything from the group of Lin Piao, just as we can expect anything from that of Chou En-lai. The two extremes come together.**

Again in my earlier writings, drawing conclusions from the Chinese press, because the Chinese comrades never informed us about these matters, **I described it as a major mistake of principle for «the armymen to take**

---

* See pp. 277-281 of this volume.

over the leadership of the party» or for «the armymen to dominate». This was done allegedly on the pretext that the leaders of the party, with the exception of those of the peasant communes, were under the influence of the group of Liu Shao-chi, that is, they were «men of this group». This was not said openly in the press, but it was confirmed in practice there. It came out (because later its reorganization began anew)**, that the party «was broken up» and «suspended» its activity during the Cultural Revolution. The same thing occurred with all the organizations of the masses, too. Only the countryside and the army escaped this «organized disorder». Thus, it turned out that the army led, or that the armymen were the main ones who were leading.** While describing such a thing as incorrect, we said that at the height of the «discorder», this «might have been necessary» temporarily and alfterwards everything must be brought within the norms. But nothing was done. This situation continued even when the «calm» began, when the «organization» of the party and revolutionary committees recommenced. The armymen were everywhere in large numbers, not as a few chosen people, but as «the chosen».

Now, with the condemnation of Lin Piao, for which, of course, we do not know the true reason, which we think must be political questions of strategy, line, they will saddle him with the blame for all these mistakes of principle, will say that Lin Piao alone was to blame for the fact that the armymen took over the running of the party and continued to do so even later. Hence, it will turn out that all these are Lin Piao's men and the clean-up with the broom, which will no doubt be done, will be presented dressed up with «principled slogans», about the «preservation of the norms» of the party, but the reality will be entirely different.

On these occasions the question is always asked:

When the norm of the party must be safeguarded why are they not safeguarded continuously, but are violated with everybody approving this and calling it right, and then some of them, «open their eyes», «correct» themselves and blame their mistakes on the rest?

Basic articles are now being written in the Chinese newspapers: «The army must strengthen its unity with the government of the People's Republic of China», «The army must support the policy of the government», «The army must learn from the people and the people must learn from the army». Astounding slogans!! What sort of state, what sort of situation, has existed and exists at present in China! **Where is the leadership of the party and the Central Committee? The army acts on the one hand, the government on the other, the situations change radically, but what sort of new situations are created? On what basis? On what norms? Of course, it is said, or rather, implied, «on the party road, on the Marxist-Leninist road, on the road of Mao Tsetung thought», but after a period, boom! Something else serious crops up.**

Let us hope that nothing dangerous for socialism in China will emerge, but the only guarantee that this will not happen is the existence of a monolithic Marxist-Leninist party.

WEDNESDAY
FEBRUARY 2, 1972

THE AMERICANS ARE BUTTERING UP CHOU EN-LAI

Yesterday the American press was lavishing praise on Chou En-lai. They called him a thinker, a philosopher, even in the way he smiles. According to them, Chou, overflowing with good will, asked them to make criticisms of him, which he accepted, saying that he would take measures «to save Peking from the smog». He told them that he had a great admiration for the American people. According to the Americans, Chou gently criticized the line of Nixon over the war in Vietnam, while the Americans praised Chou because he works hard, eighteen hours a day, and is as fresh as a daisy. They are buttering him up.

SUNDAY
FEBRUARY 13, 1972

THE COMMUNIST PARTY OF CHINA IS IN A REVISIONIST POSITION

Keng Biao, former ambassador of China in our country, has now become an important personality in the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China. He heads the Foreign Directory and always appears in the press amongst the main leaders. It is possible that after this «purge», which has been carried out in the Political Bureau, one morning he will turn up as a member of it. He is a wily person, a capable «diplomat» and loyal to Chou En-lai. Now Keng Biao welcomes and farewells the friends and comrades of the Communist Party of China, communists, revisionists and Trotskyites who visit China, and «lays down the line», of course, to those who accept it.

With us, that is, with our ambassador, he shows himself to be «on the best of terms», when he happens to meet him, he expresses the usual formulas. But when he meets the friends and comrades we have in common, in laying down the line to them, of course, he discards those formulas. When they return from China, some of the friends and comrades come and tell us that they are not in agreement with the Chinese views; some others are in agreement but, thinking that we are «on the same line as the Chinese», want to justify their anti-Marxist stands.

The Frenchman Jacques Jurquet, the main leader of

the Communist Party of France (Marxist-Leninist), who poses as being «illegal», has avoided meeting our comrades in Paris for six months since his return from Peking. He did not come to our 6th Congress, either, under the pretext of his «illegality». But now, as it seems and from what he says, that «the pressure on him and pursuit by the police is diminishing», he came to our embassy in recent days. He had even grown a beard in order to be «completely illegal».

What did Jurquet tell our comrades? That his party is growing stronger and bigger in the factory where Kazasi works, that they have expelled Kazasi from the ranks of the party, because he had criticized Jurquet personally and demanded a rendering of account from him, for violating the norms of the party. Kazasi is a worker and a former member of the Political Bureau of the Communist Party of France (Marxist-Leninist).

Jurquet then told our comrades that he had been charged by Chou En-lai with finding a revisionist writer, well-known in France, who would write about China, just as they had acted in Italy, where a known revisionist, who had been to China, had been assisted to write a book. «And I,» went on Jurquent to our comrades, «am working in the direction of the writer Chabrol, a known revisionist, whom I am trying to convince.»

Our comrades asked Jurquet why revisionists should write about China because, Chabrol, notwithstanding that he has left the revisionist party of France, is still a revisionist, a man of the bourgeoisie and anything else you like.

This matter is of no great importance, stressed Jurquet, I also talked about the meeting and the discussion which the Chinese comrades had in China with Carrillo of the Communist Party (revisionist) of Spain. The discussion was fruitful, they told me, because the Spanish revisionist

party has a correct foreign policy and also, has contradictions with the Soviets, therefore the Chinese will collaborate with Carrillo. The Chinese comrades are going to make contact with the Communist Party (revisionist) of Italy, too. It is Rumania, concluded Jurquet, which managed to bring these parties together with the Communist Party of China, and the Chinese comrades consider this a good and necessary thing.

Jacques Jurquet has completely embraced the orientations of the Chinese. After these statements which he made, he told our comrades «we are making contact with Charles Tillon, with whom we are holding talks and bringing him closer». Then our comrades said to him: «But Charles Tillon, although he has been expelled from the CP (revisionist) of France, has declared himself as an anti-Stalinist and an ardent defender of Tito, so how can you talk and unite with him?». And this revisionist replied: «As you are doing with Rumania and Yugoslavia, which you say are revisionist». Our comrades told this conceited person that he had not understood anything of the line and struggle of the Party of Labour of Albania against modern revisionism and against Titoism in particular, that he had not even bothered to read the recent reports of our 6th Congress. We maintain state relations with Titoite Yugoslavia, while ideologically we are in fierce, irreconcilable struggle with it.

On the other hand, a comrade of a communist party (Marxist-Leninist), who was in China, told us of his dissatisfaction over a number of points in the line of the Chinese comrades.

«The Chinese comrades,» he told us, «sought information about many comrades of my country, and this astonished me. I asked them to inform me about the question of Lin Piao, etc., but they turned a deaf ear and did not tell me even one word. We discussed the question of

Nixon's going to Peking with the Chinese comrades, and gave them our view about American imperialism and our attitude towards it, an attitude which conforms completely with the line of the PLA. The views of the Chinese are different. They are for collaboration and joint action against another enemy, that is, they are for the theory that we can rely on the United States of America in order to fight the Soviets and they brought up some astonishing examples: 'The Korean Workers' Party is anti-revisionist, it fights the revisionists internally, and maintains friendship with the Soviet revisionists'. Likewise, 'The Vietnam Workers' Party is anti-revisionist and maintains good relations with the Soviets'. 'Finally', the comrade referred to said: **'Chou En-lai advised us to reconcile ourselves to and collaborate with the bourgeois government of the country. These are astonishing things,' he said, 'which will cause divisions amongst us, if I put them forward in the party'.»**

It is clear that these and many other similar stands, show that China is not following a policy guided by Marxism-Leninism. **Its policy is being brought into line, and will be brought even more into line with the policy of a great power, which is trying to consolidate its positions in the international arena, through friendships, through alliances, through pragmatic relations, not based on sound Marxist-Leninist principles and on the interests of socialism and the world revolution, but on the interests of a great powerful China, which calls itself socialist, but which is not socialist in reality.**

The trend of the struggle which the Communist Party of China had declared against «leftists» is clear. This means struggle against those who adhere to principles, against those who want the struggle to be waged on the two fronts simultaneously: both against imperialism and against revisionism.

The Chinese pose as anti-revisionists, but they collaborate and are extending their collaboration with every revisionist trend, which allegedly has contradictions with the Soviet revisionists. Hence, in practice, they are united (and are united ideologically, too) with the revisionists to fight the Soviet revisionists.

The Chinese pose as anti-imperialists, they pose as if they fight the two imperialist superpowers, but actually they are developing their contacts and collaboration with the United States of America against the Soviets. Allegedly they are exploiting the contradictions. They do not say explicitly that the Soviets are the number one enemy of mankind, but they imply that the United States of America is no longer the number one enemy.

Tomorrow, in new circumstances, the roles may be changed. **The thing is, that by following a non-principled policy, and allegedly exploiting the contradictions and temporary circumstances, China cannot consolidate itself as a powerful socialist country, and the Communist Party of China cannot consolidate itself as a dauntless Marxist-Leninist party which defends principles. On the contrary, the current policy of China is being developed from a revisionist standpoint, which means that the Communist Party of China is in a revisionist position, therefore the policy which it follows cannot be the policy of a genuine socialist state.**

This worries us immensely, and our greatest worry is for the whole of mankind.

SUNDAY
FEBRUARY 20, 1973

THE CHINESE LINE AGAINST SOVIET REVISIONISM IS FOSTERED BY NATIONAL MOTIVES

In connection with the trip to China by Nixon, who leaves the island of Guam this evening to be in Peking tomorrow morning, the news agencies say that no foreign journalists will go, apart from Americans, and those who are permanent in Peking. Although they are giving this visit great publicity, they are not making any great fuss about this ban. Countless suppositions and hypotheses are being made. We shall follow the events and shall see.

The Three Different Lines

Last Sunday, the 13th February, in the newspaper «Zëri i popullit», we published an article entitled «The Line of Demarcation Between Marxist-Leninists and Modern Revisionists Cannot Be Wiped out». This political-ideological article based on the line of our Party and on the notes and theses which I have made on certain elements of the policy and stands of the Communist Party of China, **re-emphasized the unalterable militant revolutionary line of our Party against American imperialism and reaction, and against modern revisionism, headed by Soviet revisionism. I say we re-emphasized our line, because of new developments which have appeared in the international arena and in the international communist mo-**

vement, as well as in the ranks of modern revisionism.

World imperialism and, in particular, US imperialism, is going through a profound crisis. US imperialism is making efforts to get out of this crisis with the least losses and damage to itself, and to load the burden of the crisis on to its partners, the other capitalist 6tates, and its «friend» — Soviet social-imperialism. Such a profound development of the world crisis has created deep economic and political crises among these capitalist and imperialist states, which are far from solution. On the contrary, they are becoming deeper and are endangering the balance of world capitalist forces. «We achieved the status quo». The ship, if we can describe the «status quo» in this way, has been leaking all round, and they are seeking, either to abandon it, or to find new ways of agreement between the imperialist wolves.

In this revolutionary situation in the world (because the situation is revolutionary, since imperialism, capitalism and Soviet social-imperialism are in deep crisis), the role of the People's Republic of China is decisive. What course the line of the Communist Party of China takes has importance for the fate of the world revolution.

In the article referred to, we stressed certain fundamental aspects of our line, to which we remain loyal, both in strategy and tactics, because it is a matter of the defence of Marxism-Leninism and its bases. Hence, our Party has not ceased and will never cease its struggle against world imperialism, and especially against US imperialism, the number one enemy of the people. **Its present crises and those which will arise in the future result from the struggle of the peoples, and the revolutionaries must not be deceived and reduce the struggle against it, reach compromises with it, because imperialism, compelled by the defeats which it is suffering, is trying**

to pose as a lamb. The gains from the defeats of imperialism must be made on a revolutionary road and not on a liberal and opportunist road. We must take advantage of the great contradictions which exist amongst imperialists, but always on a revolutionary road, without violating and slipping from principles. This is the first point.

The other issue, just as important, which is raised in the article is the well-known thesis of our Party, **«struggle to the end against modern revisionism and, especially, against Soviet revisionism». No compromise with them. We must never cease the polemic with them and must help the genuine Marxist-Leninist forces everywhere to distinguish the truth from lies and to fight courageously and heroically to defend Marxism-Leninism.** Without fighting revisionism, one cannot fight capitalism, imperialism or social-imperialism.

One of the primary duties of our Marxist-Leninist parties is to assist the Marxist-Leninist parties which have just been formed in nearly all the countries of the world. We cannot make any compromise over principles with revisionists of any shade. We have nothing in common with them ideologically or politically, and nothing unites us with them. In order to illustrate these principled stands of ours once again, we took the question of the Communist Party of Italy (revisionist), as we could have taken that of Carrillo's Communist Party (revisionist) of Spain, or Ceausescu's Communist Party of Rumania. We do not do this for tactical reasons, but such are the facts, which our Party analyses in the light of Marxism-Leninism and from which it draws correct conclusions. Such is our line, a consistently revolutionary line, irreconcilable both with imperialism and with modern revisionism.

The other line is that of the Communist Party of China, which is a well-known line of which we have continually made analyses. It shows sudden leaps, with pauses

between. At present we can say that it seems to be against Soviet revisionism, but it is fostered by pronounced great state nationalist motives, although its propaganda tries to camouflage this distorted orientation. The Communist Party of China does not wage a stern struggle on a principled Marxist-Leninist platform, in a consistent and continuous manner. We must seek the reason for this, of course, in the vacillations in the Chinese line itself both externally and internally. The line of the Communist Party of China is not a stable Marxist-Leninist line, and the serious internal events which have taken place and are taking place continually in China prove this.

The Communist Party of China does not see the question of taking advantage of the contradictions in the non-communist world from a Marxist revolutionary basis. The Chinese have decided to make approaches to all those who have contradictions with the Soviet revisionists, whether they are other revisionists, social-democrats, American imperialists, or representatives of other bourgeois states. Of course, this policy is not being carried on openly, in the light of the sun, but the «fine» clear facts of the beginning of contacts with the Rumanians, who have also become the intermediaries for the Chinese with the other revisionists, the sweet talks with Carrillo, and so on, are quite obvious. The conclusions emerge automatically from the facts: **The Communist Party of China is seeking to form a new bloc with the revisionist dissidents, which will be opposed to the Soviet grouping and this new bloc cannot be anything other than revisionist.**

The official meeting with the head of American imperialism begins tomorrow. Nixon, the executioner of peoples, will shake hands with Mao and Chou En-lai. Our Party has told the Chinese of its opinion about this meeting in a letter. The Chinese propaganda is continuing its «attacks» on both the Soviet Union and the United

States of America, but, obviously, regarding the USA it is in two minds. It has Nixon on a visit, and at the same time it must save face in the eyes of the world. **How will things go after this meeting? There are two possible courses: either struggle, and then this meeting is a fruitless gesture, or the Chinese will proceed against American imperialism as the Soviet revisionists do, that is, «curse them by day and kiss them by night». The intensity of «the curses and kisses» cannot be concealed for long through demagogy.** The fact is that the meeting and talks with the Americans have an anti-Soviet character. According to the Chinese we can rely on the Americans in order to fight the Soviets. I have spoken above about how we must exploit the contradictions which exist between these two superpowers, but to join in their dance, to violate the revolutionary principles in order to become a major power in this wrong way, means to slip from the line.

The other recognized line is that of the Soviet revisionists. These enemies have no saving graces. They have no scruples at all, have torn off all disguise and emerged with their true features of social-imperialists, just as they are. The leadership of the Kremlin will certainly have read our article, which has not escaped the leadership of Peking, either. Their reactions have been different, and so have their actions. The leaders of the Kremlin came out again, two clays ago, with a leading article in the newspaper «Pravda», in which of course, the article of our newspaper «Zëri i popullit» is not mentioned, while the Chinese are silent, of course do not commit themselves, turn a deaf ear to the article, as if it is not speaking about them at all.

What does the theoretical article in «Pravda» say in essence?

«Struggle against American imperialism and the Sino-

American alliance», which is being achieved with Nixon's going to Peking.

The whole of this directive — Moscow's call, means: The world hegemony of the Soviet revisionists is being threatened by a third power, which for them is Mao Tsetung's China. **Being aware of the contradictions which exist between them and the other revisionist parties, the Soviet revisionists are afraid they are being isolated, and that these parties are going over to the side of China «which is welcoming them with open arms and has ceased the polemic against them». This is the ideological danger. The other fear of the Soviet revisionists is that a third power is coming between them and the Americans, thus jeopardizing their friendship, ruining the established balance and the imperialist gains which stem from this balance.** We must follow all these changes in the line and policy of China, the Soviet Union and the United States of America, and analyse them with the greatest care. We are facing major events with profound repercussions.

TUESDAY
FEBRUARY 22, 1972

MAO TSETUNG RECEIVED NIXON

Yesterday Mao Tsetung received Nixon and talked with him for one hour. What they talked about is not known.

Chou En-lai and Nixon both delivered speeches at a banquet, in which five thousand people took part. Hsinhua has not published their speeches, while foreign agencies have done so. Thus, if we base ourselves on them, Chou's speech is «friendly», very correct, full of proposals for friendly relations between the «two peoples», seeks to establish normal relations, including diplomatic relations, on the basis of the five principles. Meanwhile Nixon's speech is full of demagogy about peace, about friendship with the Chinese people, and ironical praise for them, but done delicately.

THURSDAY
FEBRUARY 24, 1972

MRS. NIXON ADVERTISES CHINA

Even Nixon's wife is joining in the propaganda. She is advertising «Chinese cooking, Chinese goods, Chinese art, Chinese silk pyjamas, and people's communes». Pat Nixon has become another Anna Louise Strong.

FRIDAY
FEBRUARY 25, 1972

THE CHINESE ARE FIGHTING TO CAPTURE HEGEMONY IN THE REVISIONIST CAMP FROM THE SOVIETS

From a reliable source we hear that Carrillo, General Secretary of the Communist Party (revisionist) of Spain (Passionaria's wing), has made known the content of the discussions on the «party» road he had in Peking with the official leaders of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of China.

He was «very satisfied» with the talks he had in Peking. The «progress of the People's Republic of China, as well as the defence measures which the Chinese have taken to cope with any eventual Soviet attack» impressed him greatly. In these directions Carrillo not only speaks with great sympathy, but has become a propagandist for China. **He admitted that the greatest mistake of his party was the stand maintained for many years on end against the Communist Party of China, therefore he «takes off his hat» first to Ceausescu, who made him understand China and put him in contact with it.** Carrillo said that the Soviets were very angry with the Spaniards over this and the Communist Party (revisionist) of France, also, was displeased with the Spanish revisionists' visit to China. He said that no one from the main Soviet leaders, or even from the middle ranking cadres, met Dolores

Ibarruri who is in Moscow. Only low level cadres met her.

The Chinese told Carrillo, «Our differences should be put aside and we should find the points on which our two sides can reach agreement». They told him, also, that they want to act in the same way with the other parties, too (the revisionist parties, obviously). Carrillo gained the impression that the Chinese want to act similarly even with the Soviets.

This trusted source of information also tells us that when **Ceausescu was in Peking he proposed to the Chinese leaders that China should return to the international organizations of trade unions, youth and women.** Contrary to what the Chinese themselves had told us previously, now it turns out that the Chinese leaders gave Ceausescu a positive reply. **That is, they intend to return, but must allow some time to pass because if they were to return now, this would cause nothing but a sharpening of the polemic.** Hence, «a more appropriate time must be found».

This source also tells us that during a visit which a delegation of the Communist Party of France made to Rumania last year, Ceausescu had informed Jacques Duclos about these ideas of the Chinese leaders, and they had made an impression on Duclos. According to our source, this will be why the Communist Party of France is not waging any stern campaign against China, although it maintains a stand against it.

On the other side of the barricade, the Soviet revisionists and their satellites of the countries of «people's democracy» (with various gradations) have launched a great propaganda campaign against China and its political and ideological line. Through this campaign, orchestrated by the conductors in the Kremlin, the modern revisionists and the open collaborators of the Americans are accusing China of revisionist degeneration and of reaching

agreement and rapprochement with the American imperialists. This propaganda exposing China is not just of a routine character, but they are giving it such an urgent and serious character that the Soviet, Bulgarian and Czech leaderships (to our knowledge) have got out letters and resolutions to their parties and the broad masses, and the main leaders themselves are going to the base to lead the discussion of them. **The question of China is worrying them, therefore they are attacking it and trying to sabotage the Sino-American collaboration, which is just getting underway with Nixon's visit to Peking this month.**

From these facts we must draw certain conclusions:

All these things confirm and reinforce our forecasts about this issue. China is gradually abandoning its revolutionary line, both in strategy and tactics, and has set out on a course with an opportunist, liberal, revisionist line. Now, with this line, it is proceeding in the direction of softening and agreement with American imperialism and the other capitalist countries. In this direction China is emerging as a dangerous competitor of the Soviets «in the benefits, and the material advantages of the policy of balance which the 'American friendship' brings them.» Both of them, the Soviets and the Chinese swear black and blue that they are against the United States of America, but friendship with it is the «thing they covet». Here there is and will be conflict between these two revisionist contenders, in the interest of American imperialism. Both types of revisionism will continue their abandonment of Marxism-Leninism, with their tattered disguises, which they are trying to maintain. This is one aspect.

Soviet revisionism will try to hang on to its hegemony in the revisionist camp, while Chinese revisionism will fight to take this hegemony from it, or at least to cut it in half. The one is defending itself, the other attacking in these fields, naturally with the same revisionist anti-

Marxist weapons. As China has declared officially in the UNO, it takes part in the «third world». On the question of the revisionist parties, too, the Communist Party of China is changing its strategy and tactics in order to gather together those revisionist parties which have contradictions with the Soviets, just as it will try to win over the «third world».

The Chinese line, agreed and harmonized with Ceausescu and Carrillo, once again confirms our views and forecasts. **China is more and more heading rapidly towards the course of a revisionist great power, towards the transformation of its line into a revisionist line. At present it is in a more acute struggle with the Soviets, whose revisionist ideological hegemony and social-imperialist great power positions are threatened by it, and is smiling on and forming links of friendship with the United States of America for a counter-weight and its own consolidation as a major capitalist power.**

This is the orientation of the new strategy and tactics which the Chinese have recently adopted and which Chou En-lai put before us orally, when he told us of Nixon's going to Peking. This is the essence, all the rest is *fioriture** and window-dressing. How this strategy and tactics will develop depends on many circumstances which we are unable to foresee, but nothing must take us by surprise, and events must not catch us asleep. **Trust and check up. Our vigilance must always be keen. We must not allow the interests of the Party, the people and socialism to be damaged, but must defend them on the Marxist-Leninist road without ever slipping from Marxism-Leninism.**

---

* Italian in the original.

BURREL, SUNDAY
FEBRUARY 27, 1972

MAO AND CHOU PLEASE THE AMERICANS

This evening the Chinese and the Americans issued a joint communique. As it emerges from what we have read in the press and seen on television, Nixon received ,a very warm and friendly welcome from the Chinese, especially from Mao and Chou En-lai. I just glanced at the communique, because I was very tired. Naturally we shall study it with the greatest attention, but at the very first glance, it seems to be flowing with sweetness about American imperialism. The Americans are pleased with Mao and Chou.

FRIDAY
MARCH 3, 1972

THE CHINESE HAVE DEVIATED JUST LIKE KHRUSHCHEV

I carefully studied and took notes on the Sino-American communique. The Chinese really have deviated, just as Khrushchev did in his time. Chinese revisionism also will develop with its own zigzags and nuances, but it is always revisionism, anti-Marxism, and in collaboration with American imperialism.

SATURDAY
MARCH 4, 1972

THE CHINESE HAVE NOT GIVEN US ANY OFFICIAL INFORMATION ABOUT NIXON'S VISIT

The Sino-American communique is most astonishing. **By means of it, Mao Tsetung will really show the world that he is opening «a new era» in the history of mankind, that he is applying «a new strategy» with American imperialism, as Chou En-lai put it to our ambassador in Peking, when he informed him of the decision that Nixon was to go to Peking.**

The communique, the speeches and the receptions showed that Nixon was welcomed to China as a friend, and not as the enemy which he is. Irrespective of the fact that he was received, they need not have brought out such a disgraceful communique discrediting to socialism and China, which trumpets that it «is a socialist country which adheres to and defends the Marxist-Leninist principles».

The Chinese could have accepted a very simple and a very cold communique in which they simply mentioned that they made contact, that they had major differences, that they decided «this or that about Taiwan», putting in what was decided, or what was not decided, and that they could carry on some degree of trade between the two countries.

Apart from other things, one matter that strikes the eye in the Sino-American communique is China's interest only in itself and the states round about it, especially

those of Indochina and Korea. **China says it is «opposed to spheres of influence», but in the said communique, together with the Americans, it defines the spheres of influence of itself, the United States of America and Japan, that is Asia and the Pacific.**

Astonishingly, China, a «big socialist» country, says nothing at all in the communique about the peoples of Europe, those of Africa and Latin America, or those of the Middle East!! This is not a stand based on Marxist-Leninist dialectics and historical materialism.

China, which talks so much about exploiting contradictions in the ranks of our enemies, has almost forgotten them, or has summed them up simply in «the Soviet — American contradictions» and, by its approaches to the United States of America, thinks that it has deepened these contradictions and done the whole job. To fail, as China has done on this occasion, to speak about the peoples of other continents who are fighting, is a colossal, irreparable mistake, which will cost it dear. **For China, apparently, the other peoples and their struggle have been and are non-existent. It is clear that all these others, of whom no mention is made, are «in the spheres of influence of the Americans and the Soviets».** This can have no other meaning.

At these moments of grave general crisis, both for American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, China, as a «big socialist» country, should have fought and manoeuvred to deepen this crisis (in order to weaken the two superpowers, to give powerful support to the peoples' national liberation struggles and the revolutionary movement, to prevent the reactionary powers in the world from becoming polarized, and for this, it should have encouraged in their dissidence those bourgeois capitalist states which have displayed resistance to, and have contradictions with American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism). But

instead of doing this, it has sought rapprochement with the United States of America, and allowed the polarization of reaction, assisted it in this crisis, discouraged the dissidents with the United States of America, and weakened the revolution. This whole phoney Marxist-Leninist policy is being carried out by the Chinese allegedly in the interests of «the triumph of the revolution». The Chinese want to tell the Americans, «we are not a super-power», while they want to tell us, «we must deceive the enemies, gain time, and give the impression that we are not for the revolution». Neither we nor the Americans, nor anyone else will fall for these Chinese tricks.

Part of Europe, which the Chinese do not even mention, is socialist Albania. **Up till today, the 4th of March, the Chinese Government has given us no official information about Nixon's visit and the talks which were held with him. Dead silence! Meanwhile Nixon, on his part, on leaving Shanghai, sent his assistant-secretaries of state who were with him, to the countries which are his allies and friends, to explain to them more extensively the talks and the results which he had in Peking. Mao and Chou have no friends, they do not inform their «friends», because they do not consider them friends.** The Chinese may be compelled to inform the Koreans and the Vietnamese, though not about everything, while the Albanians will be the last stop on the flute. The Chinese do not say this, but what they do shows it; they say so indirectly, and the communique implies it. **But what of it? We are on the right road, we are patient, and are convinced that we shall not lose, because we are Marxist-Leninists.**

SUNDAY
MARCH 5, 1972

WE DRAW CONCLUSIONS ON THE BASIS OF FACTS

Our ambassador in Peking, Xhorxhi Robo, informed us that, on the 4th of March, the Deputy-chief of the General Staff, Teng Hsiao, received our deputy-military attaché in Peking at the meeting of introduction and spoke to him, amongst other things, about Nixon's visit to China. Teng Hsiao said: «Nixon came but was not received with crowds or flowers. If the people had come out, they would have given him a hot reception. We have had major differences and contradictions with Nixon. Our views have been expressed in the communique in which there are also some things we have in common. We have not relinquished any of our principles. During the talk, Chairman Mao struck heavy blows at Nixon. We demanded that the Americans immediately withdraw their forces from Indochina. About Taiwan we told him that it is the territory of the People's Republic of China». Then Xhorxhi Robo adds that the Chinese comrade Teng spoke «against imperialism and revisionism», pointed out «the friendship which exists between our two countries», saying, «now we shall attack American imperialism more», and «link ourselves more closely with the peoples of Albania, Korea, Vietnam and Indochina».

This is what the Chinese comrade, deputy-chief of the General Staff of China said. Beautiful information!

Either this Chinese cadre has no idea of what is going on in China and the world in connection with Nixon's visit to his country, or they have told him «Tell the Albanians what we are telling you». And this cadre thinks that, since this information is sufficient for him, «it is sufficient for the Albanians, too».

However, Teng Hsiao's words, «Mao struck heavy blows at Nixon», are by no means sufficient for the Albanians. We see no sign of these «heavy blows». If the Chinese call telling Nixon, «You must withdraw from Indochina, and Taiwan is part of the PR of China», «heavy blows», then they can stomach e great deal. There are no heavy blows, either in what the deputy-chief of the General Staff said, or in the communique.

But the deputy-chief of the General Staff said one thing, no doubt unwittingly, that «the people did not come out to welcome Nixon, because, if they had come out, they would have given him a hot reception.» This means that the Chinese people are not in agreement with Nixon's visit to China, that is, they do not like this decision of Mao and Chou. The deputy-chief of the General Staff said, also, that from now on China's struggle against American imperialism would be stepped up.

Why? Nothing indicates that the struggle will be stepped up. The opposite of what they tell us is occurring. The Nixon-Mao-Chou meeting brought about the softening of the struggle, and not the hardening of it. Apparently, the Chinese think we are gullible. «Think what we tell you to think, and do not draw conclusions from what I do. There is no need for your head to work, since the heads of Mao and Chou are working», is what he means. This may be true for the Chinese, but not for the Albanians. Marxism-Leninism and his Party teach the Albanian to

judge, to reason, to draw conclusions on the basis of facts.

But will the Chinese comrades content themselves with giving us only this information, or will they give us some more? Will this be «the official information», or will they do this through the ambassador? We shall see!

TUESDAY
MARCH 14, 1972

THE COURSE OF THE SILENT BOYCOTT OF ALBANIA IS BEING FOLLOWED

Two weeks have gone by since Nixon left China. So much time has passed that even the world press now rarely mentions this «great historic world event», because it has worn out the sensations, suppositions, and is now waiting to be given and gives the direct or indirect results which may flow from these meetings. Thus, the world press pointed out in recent days that China and the United States of America decided on Paris as the centre where regular meetings between Nixon's ambassador and the Chinese ambassador will be held. Warsaw is no longer the main place for Sino-American meetings. Paris has now become the meeting place, **while the ambassadors of the parties which will meet there are not the ambassadors of the United States of America and of China accredited to France, as was the case when these meetings were held in Poland, but are special envoys.**

Hence, «regular government contacts at the rank of ambassadors have been established between China and the USA» with the centre neither Peking nor Washington, but Paris. The American-Taipeh friendship and the dignity of Chiang Kai-shek have been preserved, so this obstacle, too, has been overcome. As the foreign press reported, the day before yesterday, these two ambassadors held their first «cordial» meeting of 55 minutes in the Chinese

Embassy in Paris. This is natural, from now on nothing should surprise us.

Meanwhile, China's stand towards us at present is cold. It maintains no contacts with us, either with our ambassador in Peking, or through the Chinese ambassador in Tirana. In regard to the talks with Nixon, up till now they have not bothered to give us any information, not even a simple banal paraphrase of the Sino-American communique. They have certainly not maintained such a stand either towards the Vietnamese, the Koreans, the Cambodians, or the Rumanians. Without doubt, Chou En-lai himself has informed all these.

It may be asked, why should they inform us when we were against Nixon's going to Peking? Yes, we were against it, but we told them our opinion openly, like friends and comrades. Then, if they consider us friends and comrades, it is their duty to inform us and have the courage to say to us, «you were wrong», or «we were wrong», or «neither you nor we were wrong», or by way of information, «you Albanian comrades can draw your own conclusions», «we are informing you because we are comrades, notwithstanding that we are not in agreement on this question». This would be the most correct way. We followed this open and comradely course. Up till now, the Chinese are pursuing the course of silence and the silent boycott of Albania.

Meanwhile the Chinese are trying to show that they are correct in their economic relations with us, that they are interested in doing everything in their power to be in order. When our people engaged in economic affairs meet the respective Chinese officials, they speak well about Albania, etc. **The ice which has frozen up at the top has not extended down below.** During this period, our people are received coldly in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of China, are told banalities in the corridors and in the

reception rooms of the airport, when they come to welcome some personality. Meanwhile, Chou himself receives the Rumanians. The Chinese ambassador in Tirana has shut himself up in his «ivory tower», and when «Zëri i popullit» writes the article against Nixon, he sends the Hsinhua agents to ask our people, «who wrote this article, where can these references be found?», and other questions, which appear absurd, but which have a purpose.

Of course we shall see, but this revisionist political boycott of China against us may spread like an oil slick. Reaction and the other revisionists are noticing this stand of China and have begun to point it out. On our part, we shall strengthen our line, display our very sincere desire for friendship with the fraternal and allied Chinese people. However, we shall never cease the struggle against American imperialism and modern revisionism. **If China comes to agreement with American imperialism, then obviously the contradictions and the struggle with us will increase. We do not want this, and hope that this possibility will not come to pass, but if it does, we shall fight and overcome it, we shall defend our Marxist-Leninist line and triumph.**

SATURDAY
MARCH 18, 1972

NO ARTICLES IN THE CHINESE NEWSPAPERS ABOUT NIXON'S VISIT TO CHINA

Nixon's going to China may cause a cooling in the Albanian-Chinese friendly relations. This is a political question of major importance on which we and the Chinese have different views. I have dealt with this aspect on other occasions, hence it is not necessary to extend on it here. The Chinese consummated this problem, at least the first phase of it: they received Nixon in the way they did (I have written on this, too, at other times), and now the talks between Chinese and American ambassadors have commenced or «recommenced» (naturally, with another content, about other problems of major importance, no doubt), not in Warsaw, but in Paris. What are these ambassadors talking about? This is a mystery to everybody. When they talked in Warsaw, it was said «about the question of Taiwan»; now some Chinese official drops a hint such as, **«We shall see whether the United States of America is going to keep its word». Of course, as to what word the United States of America ought to keep, the Chinese know this, but we know one thing: that American imperialism will not keep any word, — it is, and will always be, perfidious, cunning, deceitful, blood-thirsty, an enemy of socialism and the peoples, right up to the time it is destroyed.**

If you ask the Chinese, «What word should the Amer-

icans keep?», they will certainly say. «What was written in the Sino-American Communique». However, American imperialism has never said the opposite of those things it said once again in that communique, but has always acted contrary to what it has said. Then it is better not to ask and, of course, it does not devolve on us to ask the Chinese about this matter, but we shall await what the situation and the time bring forth.

Why does it not devolve on us to ask? We told the Chinese officially, through party channels, and in a very comradely way, of our opinion about Nixon's going to Peking. They did not give us any reply, although we stressed emphatically that despite our disaccord on this problem, we were convinced that the Communist Party of China would not make any concession over principles and that our great Marxist-Leninist friendship would continue.

It was up to the Chinese to inform us, even briefly, about the talks with Nixon. They did not do so, thinking that reading the public communique was sufficient for us. This is how things turn out. Very well. We did not speak out or adopt an official stand over Nixon's going to Peking, while the whole world talked about it. At the same time, we continued our course of struggle against American imperialism and Soviet revisionism uninterruptedly, and defended our great and sincere friendship with China. **Let whoever wants to do so draw conclusions from our line.**

Nixon departed and the comments diminished somewhat. Now we see that China is silent on this issue, more silent than we are. There is no commentary, no article in the Chinese newspapers about this «historic event». Only some minor Chinese provincial newspaper, from time to time, publishes a eulogy of some Jurquet, as if Nixon's going to China was a victory for it and a defeat for the Americans.

Perhaps the Chinese want us to praise them, too! We shall never do this. But what shall we do? We shall continue our line, our friendship, despite this major disaccord over principles.

Perhaps the Chinese comrades are not taking kindly to our straight stand and, displeased, but without expressing this openly, **are maintaining a cold «correct» stand towards us at first, and, later, form a «correct» stand may turn to a stand of «peaceful coexistence» and, finally, to merely a «diplomatic» stand.** They may show themselves very correct in their economic commitments towards us, but for us this is neither sufficient nor the main thing. The main thing is the Marxist-Leninist links between our parties and our friendship. They may think, «the Albanians need us», therefore any negligence in friendship on our part may be seen as cooling, the cooling may bring the ice, and the ice brings our isolation from friendly China. But it might even happen that some rigid person among our people, who does not understand the line of our Party properly, may say: «We Albanians are in the right ideologically on this problem, China needs us». This is not in our line.

Therefore, I instructed the comrades of the Foreign Ministry and others that they must not make concessions over principles, but must show themselves very friendly, close and sincere in their contacts with the Chinese comrades. **They must not be opportunist when it is the occasion for them to express their opinion on a problem of line, must defend the line, and the Albanian-Chinese friendship is on this line...**

TUESDAY
MARCH 21, 1972

NIXON'S JOURNEY TO CHINA, THE SINO-AMERICAN TALKS, THE FINAL COMMUNIQUE

The outward stand of the Chinese side towards this journey, both before and during the time it took place, has been different. The Chinese side merely announced once or twice that the journey of the American president would be made on such and such a date, and nothing else. The Chinese propaganda maintained «absolute silence» about this event, as if «it were of no great interest». **Of course, this did not represent the reality, did not represent the importance, indeed the great importance, which the Chinese placed on this journey and the results that would emerge from it.** Superficially, it seemed as if the Chinese were not taking preparatory measures, but this was not true: they cleaned up the city, painted the shops and houses, especially in those streets and zones through which Nixon would pass, removed all the «dangerous» slogans which might annoy the «notable» guest, filled the shops will all kinds of goods, displayed books of «Chinese and foreign classics», which up till yesterday had disappeared from circulation, in the bookshops. **All these things were done under the guise of the Chinese «New Year». But no one swallowed this. These things were not done for the «Year of the Rat», but for «the coming of the... Paper Tiger».**

The Chinese press had ceased its propaganda against

American imperialism, but while waiting for Nixon, it was obliged to write several times «in defence» of Vietnam, which at these particular moments was being heavily bombed by the Americans. Hence, precisely at this time, when the Chinese were awaiting Nixon, the Vietnamese stepped up their attacks, Nixon stepped up the bombing, while the Soviet revisionists came out as «the only sincere friends of the Vietnamese», as «rabid anti-Americans», and accused China of «forming an alliance with the United States of America against Vietnam». During this time, the Chinese kept their mouths shut and did not reply to the Soviet propaganda, and it is easily understood why they were obliged to do this. The reason is that they found themselves in a weak position in regard to Vietnam and wanted to avoid making it appear that talks with Nixon would be against the Soviet Union.

Meanwhile, the other side, American imperialism and the whole capitalist world, gave this journey very great publicity, and dug up everything they could find to say or guess about it. In other words, they beat the drum so loudly that to a certain degree they managed to create the impression in the world that this journey «would change the course of history», that the rabid anti-communist Nixon would achieve that rapprochement with China which no other president of the United States of America had managed to achieve. The bourgeoisie put Nixon down in history as the «man of peace», and the fact is that during all this time its propaganda became so deafening in this direction, that his terrible work as a war criminal who is slaughtering the peoples of Indochina, etc., was obscured.

China has great responsibility in the matter of accepting Nixon in Peking without laying down the slightest condition. But not only China is responsible for this propaganda victory of Nixon. The Vietnamese themselves, who

are allegedly «angry» with the Chinese over Nixon's going to Peking, have long been engaged in secret talks with the murderers of their people. And that is not to mention the Soviet revisionists, who are up to their necks in filth through their contacts and collaboration with the Americans.

We, for our part, did not cease our struggle against American imperialism and Nixon for one moment, regardless. This was noticed by the foreign news agencies, too, which pointed out that our propaganda differed from that of the Chinese.

Thus, regardless of the fact that China said nothing until Nixon set foot on its territory, the President of the United States of America arrived in China with great publicity, with a large team of collaborators, with a large number of journalists, and with all the necessary television, radio, cinema and communication apparatuses, etc. The whole world talked about this. **One American journalist even described Nixon's arrival in China as a «landing on the moon».**

Nixon's welcome at the airport on the part of the Chinese was without crowds, without speeches, without the presence of the diplomatic corps. Otherwise, it would have been an open scandal and a challenge in any situation. The usual permanent group, comprised of Chou En-lai, Li Hsien-nien, the representative of the army at the CC of the Communist Party of China, and the whole series of officials, welcomed him there. Chou En-lai seemed very «stiff», of course, because he knew that the whole world was watching him, while Nixon was grinning like a horse, happy, laughing, regardless of the fact that the streets through which he passed were empty, certainly by orders and directives. However «the American propaganda and television took great care to make this situation seem warmer».

The «external cold correctness of the Chinese», which was apparent at the airport and in the streets, through which the cortege passed, was nothing but a *trompe l'oeil**. Instead of continuing this way with an «undesired guest», who had been allowed to come «to exchange opinions on problems of interest to the two countries», without laying down any conditions with the guest who, up till yesterday, had been described by the Chinese themselves as «the most vicious fascist criminal», «a murderer», etc., etc., the protocol observed and the stand towards Nixon took a one hundred and eighty degree turn.

The President of the United States of America had hardly rested after his journey, when he was received by Mao Tsetung, and in his working office at that. As far as we know, this had never occurred before. Mao Tsetung has always received other friends and guests, even the closest friends and guests of China, at the end of their visit. He has always received our delegations, too, at the end. The American journalists did not know that Mao would receive Nixon immediately he arrived, and apparently neither did the American delegation, therefore they described it as a «bombshell». **And in fact this reception was a bombshell. In this way Mao wanted to display his special warmth and gratitude to Nixon for these contacts and talks, wanted to display intimacy, because he received him in his studio, and on the table where the President leaned his elbows, there was a pile of books, in order to let Nixon know that he was dealing with a «great thinker». Mao Tsetung also wanted to show Nixon that it was he, Mao, who opened this «new era in the world», which is the «question of Sino-American relations», and on the other hand to tell the Chinese people that this «policy of friendship» with American imperialism «is my policy,**

* Eyewash (French in the original).

and not Chou En-lai's». If this policy does not turn out well, «we have experience and lay the blame on Chou».

The communique issued after the Mao-Nixon meeting, said only «the talks were sincere and frank», hence, it was neither fish nor fowl, while the Chinese television spoke in another language. Mao and Nixon appeared on the small screen happy and laughing, clasping each other not by one but by both hands. Kissinger was lolling, smiling and happy, in an arm-chair, as if in his own home. Chou En-lai was *aux anges** **laughing and chuckling so loudly that he became embarrassed and covered his mouth with his hand. Hence, the atmosphere was more than friendly, and this atmosphere only the Chinese television, that is, a controlled television, had captured, and then it was shown on the small screen, and this was done by Chou not without a purpose, but so that history would fix this «historic moment», so that the Americans would see it and the Chinese people, too, would be orientated by this «brilliant proletarian strategy and tactics» of Mao Tsetung.**

After this «very significant» act of Mao's, the atmosphere, which had appeared constrained, improved, the ice was broken, «a hundred flowers began ta bloom», and «they set out on the long march».

The banquet put on by the Chinese was magnificent. What did Chou En-lai say at this banquet? All the good things, as if he were addressing not a new friend but an old one, because «the Chinese people and the American people are friends», etc. Hence, Chou said: We must seek the normalization of relations between our two countries and exchange opinions which are of interest to the two sides. In the end, said Chou, the doors to friendly contacts have been opened.

This means, in other words, that Nixon is a friend of

---

* In the seventh heaven (French in the original).

China and the peoples, because it is he who opened these doors of friendship. For Chou and those who think like him, Nixon ceased to be an imperialist, a fascist, an executioner of peoples. **This means to go over to the road of lackeys of imperialism.**

«We have disagreements,» says Chou in his speech, «but these must not become obstacles to our reaching agreement and co-existing, etc. Minor disagreements exist!!!»

Khrushchev spoke like this in the past, but he was not so «genteel» with the American guests as Chou is proving to be, taking the greatest care to avoid saying any word out of place which could be misinterpreted.

For Chou, who is trying to conceal his aims, the American people are so «good» that they could not be better, «the American people are friends of the Chinese people», and **Chou continues this refrain up to the point that the orchestra at the banquet played the song «America the Beautiful»! The beautiful America of millionaires and multimillionaires! America, the centre of fascism and barbarous imperialism! America, the murderer of Vietnamese and Arabs, the suppressor of the peoples' freedom! The «beautiful» America of gangsters! The «beautiful» America where the blacks, the unemployed and the communists are oppressed and murdered!!!**

And they sing to this America in Peking so ardently that Nixon, in his reply to Chou En-lai at the banquet, said: **«I have never heard American music played better than this in a foreign country». It was clear that even Nixon was surprised, and indeed, more or less implied: «It seems I have been wrong. I thought you really were communists».**

In his speech, Nixon praises China, too, and its great hospitality, praises the kind and eloquent words of Chou. He says without any reservation, «What we are doing

here may change the world»; «...the chances of peace are endlessly increased»; «what unites us is that we have common interests which override these disagreements».

And Nixon continues:

«Let us set out together on a long march, not on an aimless course, but on different roads which lead to the same objective, to the objective of building a new world structure of peace and justice, in which all can stand together with the same dignity and every nation, big or small, will have the right to decide for itself its form of government, without interference or domination from outside...».

Nixon goes on:

«There is no reason for us to be enemies, because neither of us is seeking the territory of the other, neither is seeking domination over the other, or to stretch his hands over and dominate the world. Together, we can build a new and better world».

And how does Chou En-lai reply to this filthy fascist? He replies precisely and simply like this: «...The world is moving towards progress, towards the light and not towards the darkness». Chou En-lai eliminated the expression that the world is moving towards the revolution. The newspapers quite rightly say: **«Chou brushed aside the world revolution».** This is the scandalous and disgraceful propaganda and demagogy which Peking is making about the rabid fascist who has shed the blood of the peoples of the world, the head of the world imperialism, Nixon! And who is doing this? Peking, which claims to be the world centre of Marxism-Leninism!

The imperialist is such a demagogue that he, too, supporting Chou En-lai, says that, «The world is moving towards the light and not towards the darkness». All the American propaganda aims to bring out that Nixon and American imperialism have become friends of China and

the Chinese, friends of the people and their leaders. The ice was broken after Nixon's meeting with Mao. The Chinese newspapers were filled with photographs of Nixon, Mao, Chou, Chiang Ching, etc. The protocol meeting at the airport later turned into cordial meetings at banquets, theatres and covered stadiums, where twenty thousand people rise to their feet, applauding Nixon and Chou En-lai, the «architects» of this «historic meeting». Chiang Ching, Mao's wife, has changed her style of dress and *coiffure.* She has had her hair cut short in «urchin» style, flung her cap with the red star in the waste paper basket, and replaced her military uniform of the revolution, with gowns of black Cashmere or fine woollen fabric. At every perfomance Chiang Ching sits beside Nixon and when they are not ogether, Nixon and his wife complete their programs, visit Chinese kitchens, are «surprised and amazed», «eat with chopsticks», «what marvels!». They visit communes, kiss Chinese children, **and visit also the Great Wall. «We must pull down every wall,» Nixon says. These are «7 days that changed the world».** «**We, the United States of America and China, hold the fate of the world in our hands».** And Nixon's electoral propaganda, in the campaign for re-election as president of the United States, continues from Chinese territory! Meanwhile, Chou En-lai, for his part, is satisfied and smiling. Reaction is praising him, lauding him to the skies, but he seems to be indifferent to this because, allegedly, with this policy which he is pursuing, «he is applying the line of Chairman Mao with the greatest skill».

Hence, during the days of the visit every desire of Nixon, Mao and Chou was fulfilled. No contradiction was apparent between the two sides, apart from those expressed in a few usual formulas. In the end, the Sino-American joint communique came out to confirm their unity on many basic views. Let us examine these.

Nixon's going to Peking, the welcome he received there, and the Sino-American joint communique constitute a victory for American imperialism and for Nixon personally. Meanwhile China did not and could not gain anything out of this; on the contrary, it lost in the eyes of the revolutionary peoples of the world and the international communist movement. **China «financed» American imperialism with credibility in the eyes of the peoples. It told the peoples and the communists that even at these moments, when American imperialism is sowing death and destruction, when it has occupied their territories, when it does not have and is not going to have diplomatic relations with them, and when its system is in crisis, still you can hold friendly talks with it, sit cheek by jowl with it, and recognize its right to deceive the peoples.** This is what China has done. This is impermissible and must be condemned. It is not on our Marxist-Leninist line.

The Sino-American communique is the most disgraceful document conceivable. In this communique the «beautiful» views of the two sides are set out equally, side by side. The Chinese «feed us large helpings» of general phrases: «The peoples want freedom; where there is oppression there is resistance; the nations, big and small must be equal; all troops mus tbe withdrawn from foreign countries», etc. Thus, the Chinese side continues a long tirade without any address or concrete allusion to anyone. Only Japan and Bangladesh are mentioned by name, while everything else has been eliminated. Does, the famous politeness of the Chinese(?!) require this since «the guest is in their house»?! Why did you invite him? However, it would be better to say that the new line you are following, and not good behaviour towards the «guest» you have invited, requires this stand.

The American side indulges in an even longer tirade

in the communique referred to. It does not make any commitment, but on the contrary, according to what the communique says, «beautiful America» is the «most peaceful and democratic country», the Americans are against aggression, are in favour of self-determination for the countries of Indochina (!). The United States is ready to do this and that, whatever you want and whatever you think (plenty of beautiful phrases), but, with other words, says that it is going to maintain its friendship with Chiang Kai-shek, with the cliques of the countries of Indochina and the Republic of South Korea, that it will withdraw its troops from different regions (only in words, of course) «when tension has been reduced», etc., etc. This is the tenor of the American refrain in the joint communique.

What turned out of all this? Nothing! Almost no opposition, although they stress that «major contradictions exist» between them. Not the slightest sign of the polemic appears; but on the contrary, after they performed this «idyllic tableau» before the waiting public, they came out with what they had in their hearts. And the conclusion is this: **peaceful coexistence typical of Khrushchev, indeed more perfect than his, because according to the Sino-American communique, everything will be settled without conflicts, in other words, «without weapons, without wars», will be settled with rose petals! Truly the tiger turned out to be a «paper tiger». But one cannot work out who is the paper tiger.**

What emerges from this communique? China tells the world: I talked with the United States of America in a friendly way, and as a result of these talks war between the two of us will be avoided, the Asian-Pacific region will not be allowed to become a sphere of influence of any great power (a fable), neither party must enter into agreement with a third party against the other party (a fable), and the world must not be divided into spheres of influence (again a fable).

All these fables written into the communique are approved by the Chinese, who tell the world: «See, we forced the Americans to accept all these things, this is a great victory for socialism». The Chinese tell the gullible: «See, the Americans aren't so bad after all», and although we concluded nothing about Taiwan or the establishment of diplomatic relations, «we shall carry on trade with the United States of America, exchange scientists, artists, journalists», etc. In other words, «we opened the doors for the invasion of China by the United States of America». This is rather astounding, but this is what will occur in fact.

When Chou En-lai returned to Peking from Shanghai, where he had gone to see Nixon off, he received a triumphant welcome with gongs, with flowers, and with Chiang Chings. Chou was the «hero of the day!». This «hero of the day» will work with all his strength within the country, with the support of Mao, to strengthen the position of his group. He will rapidly develop all-round relations with the Americans, will support the candidature of Nixon, because now he is his friend, and will make many combinations with him, but will also try to avoid being badly exposed in the eyes of the peoples. For the time being the «hero of the day» will oppose the Soviets as far as he has the support of the United States of America, but in the end he, too, will throw off his disguise, as Khrushchev did. **As for the world revolution, for communism and socialism, he will put the heavy lid an them, just as the revisionists in the Soviet Union and elsewhere did. This is where the road they have taken leads them to.** May we prove to be wrong, but the facts do not permit us to judge otherwise! Marxism-Leninism, which inspires and guides us, does not permit us to judge the Chinese and their activities differently.

WEDNESDAY
MARCH 22, 1972

CHINA AND THE SOVIET UNION

As I have written several other times, before Nixon went to China, on his arrival and during his stay in Peking, as well as for days on end after he left, the Soviet revisionists launched a deafening anti-China campaign, the potential of which went beyond that of the other occasions. The Chinese were silent and are still silent towards this anti-Chinese propaganda of the Soviets.

The anti-Chinese propaganda of the Soviets, with its unmasking of China and Mao in the eyes of the peoples and international communism, was intended to prove that:

a) The Maoists reached agreement with American imperialism to divide their spheres of influence in the world and dominate the world as two imperialist powers.

b) The Sino-American agreement is being formed on the basis of anti-Sovietism, of splitting and weakening the socialist camp and international communism.

c) The Sino-American agreement is against the peoples' national liberation wars. In particular, China betrayed the interests and the war of the Vietnamese people and all the peoples of Indochina.

In general terms, these were the demagogic objectives of the Soviet revisionists against China throughout this whole period. The Soviets were beating their big drums. In this way they wanted to conceal their own betrayal and the real alliances which they have formed with the

Americans against Marxism-Leninism, against the peoples, in order to come out as defenders of the peoples of Vietnam, as «rabid» anti-Americans and «sticklers for principles». The gallery was not deceived, but we cannot say that these slanders had no effect at all. It would be wrong to think so.

After Nixon departed, China did not react against the Soviets, who continued their work, but with reduced intensity, this time with small drums, because it was Nixon's turn to go to Moscow, which has to ensure that the echo of the drums, which they had been beating loudly, should be forgotten. As long as the «enemy», who is your friend, was in someone else's house, you left nothing unsaid against him; however now, this «enemy» who is your true friend, is to come to Moscow! The music must be changed.

And Captain Leonidas (Brezhnev) spoke from the tribune of the Congres of the Soviet Trade Unions. Here we are interested in what the arch-revisionist said about the Chinese. This time he had put on «kid gloves» and softened his tone. In substance, he said: «The Soviets have wanted, have appealed and have worked for China and the Soviet Union, as two socialist countries, to collaborate closely; but China has not wanted this, has rejected the Soviet proposals and must bear the blame for this. The Soviet Union regrets this». Further on Captain Leonidas goes on in substance: «With Nixon's going there the Chinese declared that they were ready to collaborate with anyone on the basis of the policy of peaceful coexistence. Very well, then; since this is the case, since this is what you want, since this is what you did with the imperialist United States of America, we the Soviets propose to you that we co-operate on this basis; and, in the final analysis, we are ready to sign an agreement of friendship and non-agression on this basis», etc.

Now it is up to China to reply. Immediately after

Brezhnev's speech, Ilichev arrived in Pekin. Certainly, the guest is carrying the proposals in his pocket.

What will China do? Without doubt it will swim in these waters, but we shall see with what sort of stroke and at how many kilometres per hour!

MONDAY
APRIL 17, 1972

A TALK OF CHOU EN-LAI WITHOUT POLITICAL PROBLEMS

At the beginning of April, a government delegation of ours went to Peking to sign an agreement on the credit with which the People's Republic of China is providing the People's Republic of Albania for agriculture.

We could have sent some deputy minister to China at the head of the delegation for this purpose, but we sent the minister in order to somewhat enliven the relations between Albania and China, because we had the impression that some coolness had existed on the Chinese side since the time of Nixon's visit to Peking. We said nothing about this visit in the press, ignoring it completely, but continuing our friendly line with Mao Tsetung's China on all the other fronts. (Apart from sending the minister of agriculture to China, we undertook a series of other friendly activities, which the Chinese, for their part, welcomed enthusiastically and responded to reciprocally. They received our delegation very well in Peking. Three thousand people had come out to the airport with music, banners and portraits.

The purpose of sending the minister to China was not only to give importance to the agreement which he would sign, and to express our thanks to the Chinese comrades for the aid they were giving us, but since he is also a candidate of the Political Bureau, to affirm to them,

in the meetings with them and the speeches which he would have occaion to deliver, our unchanging policy of great friendship and unity with the People's Republic of China and the Communist Party of China. Naturally, the question of Nixon would be passed over in silence, because it was not up to us to raise this problem. It was up to the Chinese to tell us something, as a reply to the letter of the Central Committee of our Party, and to inform us, even briefly, just to observe the formalities, about the results of the Mao-Chou En-lai-Nixon talks. Hence, by our sending a candidate of our Political Bureau to China, Chou En-lai Was given the possibility of expressing himself on this problem, if he saw it reasonable to do so. The head of the delegation had been instructed that, if Chou En-lai raised this matter, he should thank him for the information and say that he would transmit this information to the leadership. He was not to express any opinion, but in general was to affirm the belief of our Party that the Peoples Republic of China and the Communist Party of China always «wage» struggle on the two fronts, both against American imperialism and against Soviet revisionism, and that they «stand firmly» on the principles of Marxism-Leninism. If Chou En-lai did not open this conversation let the responsibility for this fall on them. We did our duty, indeed even by reminding them through the personality whom we sent at the head of our delegation, that they ought to carry out their duty towards us, even formally, irrespective that we were not in agreement with them.

We thought that Chou En-lai, as the clever «politician» he is, would not miss this opportunity, but we were wrong. Chou En-lai received the delegation (and here we base ourselves on the radiogram which we received from Peking, in which we were told about the conversation). Chou En-lai opened and closed the conversation, while the head

of our delegation merely interposed a few unimportant things. Chou did not talk to him at all about political matters (although it is usual of him to talk at length about these matters) and said nothing about Albania (except to ask after the health of our comrades...).

Chou's talk was a self-criticism towards us in other directions. He said, «The tractors which we sent you have defects in the crank-shafts, and the Mig-19 aircraft also have defects; therefore, don't use them until we send a team to check and repair them. The trucks and jeeps which we have sent to Vietnam and the sugar-cane harvesters we have sent to Cuba have also turned out to be defective», etc.

At the end of his talk Chou linked the shortcomings and mistakes in their machine-building industry and their military industry with «the sabotage activity of the elements belonging to the ultra-left trend». He said that «the ultra-left trend» in China had aimed to sabotage the successes achieved during the Cultural Revolution and to restore capitalism there. Our military industry was damaged, indeed ruined, over two or three years, he continued. Over the engines for the No.6 fighter aircraft alone, Comrade Yeh-Chien-Yin held a meeting, which went on for ten days, to talk with the specialists and find the causes of the defects in these aircraft. He was told that such defects occurred at the start in these types of aircraft and that even the engines of the Soviet aircraft operated for only a hundred hours. In the past, however, added Chou, we have had engines which operated for 200 hours. Then how did it come about that the capacity of these engines fell from 200 to 100 hours? There are some engines which operate for only 25 hours. «The elements of this trend have caused us very great damage in the army,» concluded Chou, «we are telling only you Albanian comrades about this.» This was the only political

allusion of the talk, and he said nothing further. Chou asked us to make «critieism» over the machinery which we receive from them, and said that they would take measures on the spot to correct all the shortcomings which have been found.

In parting with the head of our delegation, amongst other things, comrade Chou En-lai said to him: Comrade Kang Sheng is still sick, suffering from bronchitis. When Ceausescu came here Comrade Kang Sheng turned out once to meet him, but afterwards the doctors advised him not to come out again. And in fact Comrade Kang Sheng does not feel well, and is unable to turn out for work. We believe that with this he wanted to tell us that, «they had not purged him like Lin Piao».

According to the radiogram Which we received from Peking, this was Chou En-lai's talk. These are the main ideas of this talk. Hence it is clear: Chou En-lai did not want to enter into political questions, although he does this with great pleasure. «We (the Chinese) remain in our positions, you in yours. We are respecting our commitments on matters of economic relations, and will always be correct». This is what Chou implied. Well, we stick to our line, we have always been in order and correct in our relations with China. Chou did not reply to the letter of our Central Committee, did not speak even this time, although it was up to him to speak. We get the message.

What conclusions can we draw?

It is not a normal thing for Chou En-lai not to deal with political matters in a talk with one of our comrades. Did he have political problems of first-rate importance which he should have dealt with? Yes!

a) **The relations with the United States of America are new relations.** We think that he should have said how far, or in what directions, these relations will be developed.

Chou En-lai may hide behind the pretext that «since you were against Nixon's visit to China and ignored this visit, why then is it necessary that we should inform you about it?». Fair enough, we were opposed to this visit, but now that it has been made we are interested to know what has been achieved from it and how the Chinese intend to develop their policy with the United States of America in the future. We have the right to ask such a thing, because we are the allies of China. The Chinese comrades may say: «You were informed through the Sino-American communique, and after this our policy regarding the United States of America has not altered». Although this is not so (because the coming and going of personalities of the two countries continues, not to mention what is being discussed and achieved between them, because these are secret discussions), it is still up to them to tell us because **earlier we were told officially that «what we are doing with Nixon is a new tactic and a major strategy»**. Hence Chou En-lai remained completely silent on this major problem because his positions are weak and he would have had to make certain denials or admissions about which he is not sure, therefore he remained prudent. But his prudence shows the hesitation and uncertainty in the policy which China is pursuing with the United States of America. The main tactical and strategic objectives which were to be achieved are not becoming visible either in China or in the international arena. We think that in the international arena this political action of China towards the United States of America did not bring it any gain but harm.

b) **The problem of Vietnam.** There, the great military offensive by the Vietnamese side has begun. The Americans and their puppets are receiving heavy blows. This is a major victory not only for the Vietnamese people but for all of us. Our policy has been and is that the

Americans must be driven out of Vietnam. We support Vietnam in this direction.

However, Chou En-lai was silent about the victories of the Vietnamese people in this war. Why? Because relations between the Chinese and the Vietnamese are not good, and there is no doubt about this, because of the course the Chinese are following towards Nixon, whom, the Vietnamese rightly call the greatest war criminal. The Chinese, who played host to Nixon, met him and talked with him; the war of the Vietnamese has put the Chinese in a difficult position. This means: «While I am shedding my blood, you accept my murderer as a friend and talk with him». China made official statements and in the communique which the two sides signed affirmed that it «would not talk with Nixon about the war in Vietnam». This was a major political and strategic mistake on its part. The Chinese may say that «the Vietnamese did not want» us to talk about them with the Americans. Irrespective of this, China should not have left this question in silence, as it did. The Soviet revisionists benefited from this and now they are posing as «the main inspirers and supporters of the Vietnamese offensive».

Hence Chou was silent about Vietnam, too, because the policy with Nixon has shut his mouth. Even in the position it is in, China continues to supply Vietnam with material aid as before, but its political aid is weak.

c) **China's policy towards Pakistan and Bangladesh suffered a fiasco!** What could Chou say? About the Middle East and Europe he was completely silent, as in the Sino-American communique.

d) **He did not make the slightest mention of the Soviet revisionists, either. Why?**

The problem which Chou touched on briefly was that of the «ultra-left trend», which has caused «great harm to China and wanted to establish capitalism there». Of

course, Chou was referring to the Lin Piao group without mentioning the name. This is their old tactic. What he told us Albanians «in confidence» does not tell us much. What has this trend done? It wanted to establish capitalism!! But how? Merely by sabotaging the aircraft? Can a sister party be satisfied with only this? Either inform it properly, or don't inform it at all!!

As for the sabotage of the aircraft and the helicopters, this is not a new problem. The main Chinese military comrades, indeed the very top ones, some of whom were purged with the «ultra-left group», told our comrades who were in China in 1968-1969 about this. That is, the sabotage on the aircraft was discovered when Lin Piao was «omnipotent». However, on their part, this may be considered, «an act of conspirators», and indeed their main action. Chou En-lai told us nothing else. Having told us this much, he now considers that he has performed his duty of «solidarity towards the Party of Labour of Albania». We are not of the same opinion and think that, since he raised this problem, he ought to have explained it.

On the question of Kang Sheng, which they frequently repeat to us, they want to say that «he is sick and has not been purged with the ultra-left group». However, this «influenza» or «bronchitis» seems to be going on for a long time. It is more than a year since Kang Sheng appeared in public. This is their affair, but it seems to us that on this question, too, they are not serious.

THURSDAY
APRIL 20, 1972

CHINA IS GETTING DEEPER INTO AN IMPASSE

China reports that yesterday two of the most important American senators, Mansfield and Scott, the main representatives of the two American parties, arrived in Peking. They go to China as «friends» and will hold talks with Chou En-lai. It is not known whether they will meet Mao. We shall see.

The visit of these two main imperialist envoys gravely damages the reputation of China and puts it even more thoroughly on a very wrong road with no way out, the road which began with the visit of Nixon to Peking. They have gone at a time when the war is raging furiously in Vietnam, when the Vietnamese are advancing, when the Americans and their puppets are suffering blows, when Nixon gives orders and Hanoi, Haiphong and the Vietnamese troops in the South are savagely bombed.

This situation is terrible for China, while Chou continues the course he began. The Soviets are protesting that their ships were hit at Haiphong, threaten that they may not accept Nixon in Moscow and, taking advantage of this situation, pose as if it is they (the Soviets) who are assisting Vietnam in its victory. Nixon threatens to blockade Haiphong. Then the Soviets might seek permission from China to send war materials through its territory. If China does not accept this, and it will not, then the situation will become more difficult for it.

SATURDAY
APRIL 22, 1972

THE VIETNAMESE OFFENSIVE AND CHINA

Yesterday our government delegation returned from China and today it reported to us on the work it had done there. On the economic side everything went well, while on political questions there was nothing but complete silence.

For more than three weeks the Vietnamese have been attacking the American forces and the puppets of Saigon from all sides. They have opened four important fronts: one in the direction of Hue, which they have left behind; one front from Laos in the centre, apparently with the aim of cutting South Vietnam in two, isolating the enemy forces in the northern zone of South Vietnam from those of the Saigon front; the third front they have opened north of Saigon where they have taken the town of An Lok, an important key to Saigon, which they are threatening from the north (according to the news, they are 60 kilometres from Saigon); and the fourth front has been opened south of Saigon, from Cambodia (they have reached some 40 kilometres from Saigon). The main objective is the encirclement and capture of Saigon. A second, much more resounding Dien Bien Phu. This will be the decisive victory if they achieve their aim. The defeat of American imperialism in Vietnam will be total and ignominious.

At present, American imperialism and Nixon have their backs to the wall. There is nothing they can do, except to use their tactical and strategic air force which cannot possibly have much effect. Their vietnamization of the conflict has ended in fiasco: the puppets of Saigon are not holding their positions anywhere. The tactic of the Vietnamese is to continue their offensive and at the same time to demand that the Americans sit down at the negotiating table in Paris. So far the Americans are refusing and will not come to talks unless the Vietnamese cease the offensive.

This situation has placed Nixon and his administration in a difficult political situation, especially on the eve of the presidential elections. His opponents are fighting hard against him. There are strikes and demonstrations in the country. Yesterday Nixon was obliged to close a series of important universities, because students and professors rioted. It is said that Nixon will deliver an «important» speech next week.

The war tactic of the Vietnamese will turn out successful provided they carry on and do not retreat from this correct tactic, because this alone will bring victory.

The relations of the Chinese with the Vietnamese are cold. Many facts which I have mentioned in earlier notes confirm this situation, but by chance we are learning other facts which strengthen our conviction.

In recent days our ambassador in Hanoi had a talk with the Chinese military attache in Vietnam. He told him: **«We (the Chinese) know nothing about these offensives, because the Vietnamese do not inform us. We do not know whether this is a serious action which will be carried through to the end, or an adventure which will cost them dear. The Soviets have a finger in this offensive».** Just these admissions from this very responsible person within Hanoi, clearly indicate the situation which exists between

the Chinese and the Vietnamese. Apart from the major question that the Chinese are kept entirely strangers to the aims of the Vietnamese, what he said **also creates doubt on the issue: are the Chinese for or against the present offensive?** If they are for it, the Chinese military attaché should have approved and supported the offensive of the Vietnamese, regardless of the fact that the Vietnamese have not informed them about it. But there may also be the other aspect, that the Chinese consider this offensive of the Vietnamese an adventure, making ,an analogy with the war in Korea, when the Korean army advanced as far as Pu San, and the Americans counter-attacked, and reached the Yalu river on the border with China.

Are these the reasons that make the Chinese call the Vietnamese offensive an «adventure»? Together with this, can they be thinking that, since the Soviets have a finger in such an offensive, they have pushed the Vietnamese into this adventure in order to bring the war to the borders of China by provoking a new attcak à la McArthur in Vietnam, and this will give the Soviets cause not only to spread propaganda against China, but also to implicate it in a war with the United States of America, or to get a foothold, themselves, in Vietnam and encircle China from the south? All these variants are possible.

But there is also another variant. The change in the strategy and tactics of China, and especially towards the United States of America, has made China alter its main aims.

In connection with Vietnam, China was opposed to the talks of the Vietnamese with the Americans in Paris and considered them to be in vain. When China itself entered into secret talks with the United States of America, it changed its stand on this question. The Vietnamese in Paris proposed their 7-point program, the Americans pro-

posed theirs. This was the time when the agreement on Nixon's going to China was announced. Precisely from this time on, the Americans did not give much more importance to the Conference in Paris. Why? There is no doubt, it must be thought that Nixon was going to talk about Vietnam in Peking. And there are reasons why it must have been so. The North Vietnamese jumped up and certainly quarrelled with the Chinese, to the extent that Chou En-lai was obliged to declare publicly that «the question of Vietnam would not be touched on with Nixon». Here lies the source of the conflict.

However, this conflict must have taken place within the Chinese leadership, too, that is, between Mao and Chou En-lai on the one side, and Lin Piao and the army-men, or the «extreme leftists», as they have described them, on the other side. We have to suppose that Mao and Chou were in favour of Nixon's going to Peking and for softening the policy towards the United States, as well as for the settlement of the Vietnam problem to some degree with talks, while Lin Piao and the other comrades were against Nixon's visit, against this softening of the policy with him and for the further development of the fighting on the part of Vietnam. It must be for this that they have been accused as «ultra-leftists».

The Chinese conceal this main question and tell us contradictory things which don't hold water. For example, they say that «the ultra-leftists were pro-Soviet», and they link this with the fact that the Soviets might have a finger in the Vietnamese offensive. According to the Chinese, the ultra-leftists say that «politics must be in command», while they hold that «industry must be in command». This is a completely revisionist thesis. «The ultra-leftists are against industry and modern industry, against the skilled crafts». What contradictions!

And so on, a series of such stupidities. The Chinese

raise many natural shortcomings and mistakes in work to principles, and blame them on the «extreme leftists». Such things can't be swallowed!

The Chinese find themselves in difficulties to make the change, therefore they don't publicly accuse the «ultra-leftists» of political mistakes, but accuse them of these contradictory things of secondary importance which, even when they are obliged to turn over the page, prove as hard to grasp as slippery fish.

Now the Chinese comrades tell us that «the Vietnamese are two-faced people».

Our ambassador in Peking informs us today that a reception was given recently for an African personality. Present at the dinner was Chou En-lai, who tried to give the guests the impression that they have «very good» relations with Vietnam. But it turned out the opposite. He rose from the table, went towards the diplomats and beckoned to the two Vietnamese ambassadors, of the North and the South, to approach,but they did not move from their place. Chou En-lai went over and began to talk to them. They listened to him with marked indifference, which struck the eye of all those who were watching. In the end, the two Vietnamese ambassadors, maintaining that same indifferent stand, implied to Chou that they did not understand what he said, so that Chou was obliged to summon a translator. This incident struck the eye of all present and made a big impression.

However, the situation between China and Vietnam appears to be unhealthy. The Soviet revisionists and the American imperialists are benefiting from this situation to the detriment of the Vietnamese people, who are fighting heroically. It is our duty to support their just struggle with all our strength.

MONDAY
MAY 22, 1972

NIXON IN MOSCOW — CHINA IS SILENT

Moscow welcomes the American fascist gangster Nixon and justifies this shameful tragedy with the so-called policy of Leninist coexistence.

Lenin, allegedly, has taught these new imperialists to form friendships and alliances, to divide and dominate the world with the imperialists, colonialists, and the permanent executioners of peoples, the oppressors of their freedoms, the plunderers of the riches and independence of other countries. What perfidy! What cynical Trotskyism!

Before he left for Moscow, Nixon took every possible measure to «sully» Lenin: he savagely bombed Vietnam, he mined the Vietnamese ports and coastal waters, and is continuing the most barbarous war that could be waged. At the peak of this savage activity, this fascist bandit took the aircraft and arrived in the Moscow of Lenin and Stalin where the Soviet traitors welcomed him at the airport. The anthem of the Soviets, that anthem which led the liberation war, was played for him. The guns which destroyed the Nazi beast fired again, this time to salute a second Hitler, who has been attacking the heroic people of Vietnam with guns, with bombs, with napalm, with machine-guns, and every type of weapon, twenty four hours after twenty four hours, for years on end. This is how far the revisionist traitors, who are shaking hands

with and smiling on the hangman, who are eating and drinking with him, who are plotting with him, at the expense of the other peoples, to divide the world between themselves, have gone in their cynicism.

The murderer of Vietnamese children will certainly visit schools and nurseries of Soviet children, will bare his teeth at them in his cynical smile, will shake the hands and pat the cheeks of the grand-children of those heroes who hurled themselves into the fiercest battles which history has known, against capitalism and world imperialism. Now the new Kornilov, the new Denikin with the face of Nixon, strolls in Moscow and the Kremlin, surrounded with honours by the new Trotskyites and Bukharinites.

At the sumptuous banquet in the Kremlin, the filthy ferocious fascist Nixon spoke «about peace, freedom, coexistence and the friendship between the United States and the Soviet Union». He said, «We are opening a new page for mankind», and did not fail to stress, «We, the biggest states of the world, must ensure that the small states moderate their feelings». It could not be put more clearly: «We must put down the revolution in the world, we must keep the peoples under rein, and they must do what we want and what we order». And Nixon uttered these words in the Kremlin, where the great Lenin worked and fought at the head of the Bolsheviks, in the Kremlin where the proletarian revolution seethed.

Now the counter-revolution prevails in this Kremlin and Nixon, linked arm-in-arm with the new Kerenskys, visits the tomb of Ivan the Terrible, the relics of the Czars, the cellars where the treasures of the Soviet Union are stored. The Mausoleum of Lenin is silent, but Lenin is not dead, Leninism is alive. Today or tomorrow, it will sweep away all this vileness, too, which will be

routed and crushed by the proletarian revolution. The betrayal will be smashed.

With the greatest shamelessness, Podgorny said explicitly in his speech, «We desire that tension in the world should be reduced», that is, that the revolution should die down, that the peoples should not rise for their rights. Podgorny openly demanded from the United States of America: «We must avoid war between the two of us; as for the other things we can regulate them and reach agreement between ourselves». Clearly this means division of spheres of influence in the world between the United States of America and the Soviet Union. Podgorny asserted openly that «up till now the Soviet-American collaboration has been in favour of peace», hence the war against individual peoples on the part of these two superpowers is not important, because for them this is a normal and necessary thing.

Meanwhile the friend of the Soviet revisionists Nixon openly threatened the peoples with the atomic bomb, saying, «We, the great powers, must exercise self-restraint in the use of the nuclear weapons, because we might come to the point of a head-on clash». This means: «You other peoples, restrain yourselves in your demands, listen to us, the great powers, take us as your arbiters, make us your judges to settle your problems, and don't raise obstacles that will make us take off our wigs, because in that case we shall destroy the whole world». Such is the threat that Nixon and the Soviet counter-revolutionaries are making to the peoples of the world.

«A new century is being ushered in», said Nixon, about the present Moscow meeting. This is the challenge which world capitalism, headed by American and Soviet imperialism, is throwing down to the proletariat, the peoples and the revolution. The peoples, the Marxist-Leninists,

the revolutionaries will fight on to total victory over the enemies.

And while Nixon and Brezhnev are plotting tête-à-tête in Moscow, China is saying nothing at all about these problems, but is maintaining a policy of total silence, while the Vietnamese are continuing their offensive successfully. Bravo to the Vietnamese heroes!

MONDAY
MAY 29, 1972

THE SOVIET-AMERICAN TALKS IN MOSCOW AND CHINA'S STAND

The visit of Nixon, the President of the United States of America, to Moscow is not a minor, unimportant matter. Neither are the talks which are being held there between Brezhnev and Nixon, between American imperialism and Soviet social-imperialism, unimportant, indeed they have great importance. The whole world, all the peoples, all governments are interested and expressing their opinions about what is going on in Moscow, about the open and secret plans and plots which are being hatched up there to the detriment of the peoples of the world, their future and peace, by the two imperialist superpowers. **Only Mao Tsetung's China is silent! China has not announced even the fact of Nixon's going to Moscow, let alone all the rest, through its press and radio.**

China is concealing from its own people that its guest of three months ago, who was received there so warmly, is now in Moscow. Why are they keeping this secret from the people? This is one of the Chinese puzzles! **To ignore such an event about which the whole world is talking and taking a stand, is a political absurdity, to say the least of it. To maintain such a stand on the reasoning, «I am China» and «ignore you», this, too, is unrestrained political megalomania which goes beyond all**

bounds. This, again, is a political absurdity arising from great-state chauvinism, which is expressed today in these forms and about these problems, but goes on tomorrow over other problems. The peoples are asking the logical question: «What opinion has this great socialist state which is distributing the quotations and ideas of Mao Tsetung throughout the world, about these world events which the imperialists are cooking up?» China is silent, or to put it more correctly, the Chinese press and radio are noisily commemorating the 30th or 40th anniversary of an article by Mao on literature and art. Following this «literary event», as though they have the desire to reply to the series of treaties and agreements which have been signed in the Kremlin by Nixon and Brezhnev, «Renmin Ribao» published an infantile editorial in which it tells world opinion to learn world history!

Can the Chinese have promised Nixon not to criticize US imperialism? Is there an agreement between them that they will cease the polemic for the sake of achieving these agreements? These things make one suspicious. However, the facts are facts, China is no longer in these militant revolutionary positions against imperialism, especially against American imperialism.

When Nixon was to go and did go to China, the Soviets poured out every kind of abuse and slander against China. A sickening scandal! **The Chinese remained silent, did not say a word, but we note that they told us «in confidence»: «When Nixon goes we shall give the Soviets the stern reply they deserve».** Nixon departed, many months passed before he went to Moscow, he did all those things in Vietnam, while the Chinese neither wrote nor spoke against the Soviets. Again silence. And this heavy, suspicious, murky silence is still going on. This means

cessation of the polemic, cessation of the ideological-political struggle.

Why is this? Can it be that the Chinese are in secret negotiations with the Soviets about a policy of peaceful coexistence, as the revisionists understand it? Or are they in agreement with what has been signed between Brezhnev and Nixon in Moscow and China aspires to join in the same dance on equal conditions? One is forced to suspect even this. No other explanation can be found for this Chinese silence.

All the capitalist states of the world, whether or not allies of the United States of America, are very worried about the Soviet-American alliance, about their drive to world hegemony, about the division of spheres of influence between them. And all of them, in one way or another, open or half-disguised, are expressing this worry.

The Soviets and Americans openly talked and sealed agreements in Moscow. In other words, they said: **«We are two atomic superpowers, we make the war, we guarantee the peace, we are keeping the terrible atomic potential we have created, and we two decide what we must increase and what we must reduce».** This means: **«The whole world must tremble before us and obey us, we make the rain fall and the sun shine».** They continue: **«We must not sell arms to other peoples, because of course, they complicate matters for us, rise in revolt, make revolution against us; therefore, if such things occur, we, the two superpowers, must moderate their feelings, although both of us are against interference in the affairs of other peoples, we are the guarantors of their freedom, independence and sovereignty». And they continue: «We should develop large-scale trade between ourselves; in specific zones, we should carry on minor trade with other states, and avoid putting a spoke in each other's wheel; in the states of these zones, we should create our own cliques,**

bring them to power, and take care to strengthen them or to overthrow them if they do not obey us, from within, of course, to avoid making our interference all that obvious; we should monopolize science, medicine and the whole of space».

In other words, they are saying: **«We should become masters of the fates of peoples and states, should buy their opinions and feelings; the land, the sky and everything should belong to us, while we shall give the others the crumbs left on our table». «In this way,»** they continue, **«we achieve the old dream of capitalism, create the barons and the slaves, and between them stand the lackeys and the** *lancequenets**.**»*

These, and other things like these, were said, decided, and sealed openly, without kid-gloves, without the slightest shame, in the Kremlin, where Lenin and Stalin, the sons of the proletariat and its leaders, the most faithful pupils of Marx and Engels, lived, worked and fought.

But how many other things, even more dangerous for the peoples, were decided in the greatest secrecy by the czar Brezhnev and the fascist Nixon? Time will reveal this and life will prove us right, because the Party of Labour of Albania is that Party in the world which raises its voice as it should, and exposes the treachery of the revisionists and the Soviet-American plots.

The Chinese always raise the issue that every political action of theirs (which smells of opportunism) is undertaken to exploit and deepen the contradictions. This is what they said when they began their honeymoon with the Rumanian revisionists; they said this when they smiled to Tito; they declared this when they talked with the Spaniard Carrillo; and, finally, they said this when they met Nixon. But to what extent did they deepen these con-

---

* Mercenaries (French in the original).

tradictions? Did the Chinese gain or did the others? Of course, the Chinese lost. Contradictions between the Soviets and the other revisionists existed and still exist, but we see that whether it be Tito, Ceausescu, Gierek, or Hussak, they are softening rather than sharpening their contradictions with the Soviet Union (because they are afraid of it). This is the truth, but the Chinese ought to draw from this the conclusion that their so-called aid did not lead to any sharper contradictions, and neither the revolution, nor socialism gained anything from it.

But what about the contradictions between the Soviet Union and the United States of America — have they been deepened through the policy of the Chinese? The latter can say what they like, there are and there will be contradictions between the two imperialist superpowers, but with Nixon's visit to Moscow and with what was decided there, the contradictions mark a relative softening, even if we accept that it is just for demagogy and propaganda.

What have China and socialism gained by the toning down of the revolutionary struggle on the part of the Chinese? Nothing! I think that both China and the revolution have lost. In Vietnam China created a coolness and placed the Vietnamese in a position where they had to tell the Chinese openly not to talk with Nixon about the question of Vietnam. The Vietnamese, on their part, began the offensive and are continuing it with success, even now when Nixon has completed his business in Moscow. What does this mean? Clearly it means that there are two roads: there is the revolutionary road, on the one hand, and the road of «Khrushchevite peaceful coexistence», on the other. The latter is not a worthy road for socialist China.

But all this non-realistic, non-consistent, non-Marxist-Leninist policy of the Chinese comrades has also created a cooling and obvious distrust among the revolutionary forces

and the (Marxist-Leninist) communist and workers' parties in the world. Previously, they talked about China, were proud of it, based themselves on it and supported it, indeed they posed as Maoists in exaggerated ways, and so on. Now, in the contacts which they have with us, they don't talk about it at all, and we are obliged to «stir up» the fire a little, because it has gone out. Astonishing switches have been made in China, which is going through astonishing moments. When we fought revisionism and imperialism with our propaganda, the Chinese remained mute. Then they began to publish our articles, but said nothing themselves. Later, besides the publication of our articles, they began to speak themselves. After this they stopped speaking themselves and continued with our articles, while now they are neither speaking themselves, nor publishing our articles. This shows not simply vacillations, but vacillations to the right.

Despite these things, we have not given up hope that China will correct these stands, because this will be greatly in the interests of the revolution and socialism. We shall struggle persistently in this direction, maintaining resolute Marxist-Leninist stands in policy and ideology, and strengthening our friendship with China on the Marxist-Leninist road. Acting in this way, we think we are not making opportunist concessions on this question, but are trying to exert influence for the better.

However, one thing is clear: the «new strategy and tactics» of Chou and Mao in the direction of the United States of America was not imposed on China painlessly. It brought about a reaction and the measures which are known, but which have never been announced, were taken. These measures may be rocks on their road, which will hinder them from making a turn to correct their mistakes. On their part, they say that «the mistakes must be corrected courageously», but when the time comes to

correct them, the courage is lacking, because these mistakes were not imposed painlessly and again it will be painful to correct them. Whichever way it is done, Marxism-Leninism teaches us that mistakes must be avoided, but when they are made, it is absolutely obligatory to correct them.

FRIDAY
JUNE 9, 1972

THE CHINESE HAVE CEASED THE POLEMICS AGAINST AMERICAN IMPERIALISM AND SOVIET REVISIONISM

Functionaries of the Foreign Ministry of China tell our comrades in Peking: «Regardless of what the Soviets and the Americans do, what plans and plots they hatch up, we shall go on with our own work». Stuff and nonsense! What are they doing? They are not speaking at all! They have completely ceased the polemic both with the United States of America and with the Soviets, who, on their part, are saying nothing at all about China. Tranquility, heavenly peace reigns! This situation will spell nothing good!

The Polish revisionists who are in power, are carrying on a two-faced policy towards China: openly, in the press, they abuse it roundly, while with the Chinese ambassador they speak sweet words, say that they want to extend their relations, and indeed the Polish ambassador in Peking openly criticizes the Soviets. The Chinese see the latter, do not take notice of the former, and believe the Poles, that they allegedly have contradictions with the Soviets. Of course, they have contradictions, but the Chinese should not trust the Poles, because they are for breaking away from the Soviets in order to link up with the Americans.

TUESDAY
JUNE 13, 1972

SECRET DIPLOMACY BETWEEN «COMMUNISTS» AND IMPERIALISTS

The Soviets and the Americans have certainly talked long and extensively in Moscow about Vietnam and to its detriment. These two savage imperialists want to emerge from this war «with their honour and reputation unscathed», to profit from the blood shed by the Vietnamese people. The question is what different pressures the two will employ simultaneously to force the Vietnamese to their knees. The Americans will continue to use the weapon of war and terror, while the Soviets will use demagogy, pressure and blackmail about cutting off, or «difficulties» in supplying, their so-called aid to Vietnam.

Of course, everything depends on the stands of the Vietnamese. Up till now the Vietnamese have been fighting the Americans and resisting the Soviets. Now Hanoi, and the Vietnamese ambassadors abroad, are speaking openly about their dissatisfaction with the Soviets and condemning them, a thing which they did not do previously. As a consequence of this, faced with the situation which has been created, the opportunist wing in Hanoi must be in a difficult position and in the minority. At present this minority is obliged to submit to the correct view of the majority, which is for fighting through to victory on the basis of the 7 points. They are saying noth-

ing about China, but have softened the stony attitude which Nixon's going to Peking brought about.

On the 15th of this month, Podgorny, personally, will go to Hanoi for talks. Of course, he will go allegedly to tell the Vietnamese about the «heroic stand of the Soviets» towards Nixon, about «the stern criticism» which they made of the American President, and claim that they did not permit themselves to make «any concession» in principle not only over the war in Vietnam, but also over all the world issues which were discussed. This will be what the Ukrainian horse carries in his saddlebag, this will be the dung he drops at the door of the Vietnamese. To what extent the Vietnamese will be taken in by this, is another matter. However, behind these «breast-beatings», pressure and blackmail will be exerted in the form of «wise council», allegedly «in the impossibility of sending aid in the situation that has been created», «because of the lack of readiness on China's part to allow this Soviet aid to pass through its territory», etc. Podgorny will not fail to tell the Vietnamese that the United States of America is allegedly in difficulties and that Nixon gave obvious indications that: «If you concede a little (enough to save his reputation), he will concede, too», and other such tales.

The Ukrainian Podgorny will not fail to denigrate China in the eyes of the Vietnamese. Of course, Podgorny will tell them that «Nixon has sympathy and respect for the Chinese leaders, because they have reached agreement with the Americans over many vital problems of Asia, that it has been announced officially in China that Kissinger is to go to Peking on the 19th of June to continue the talks Nixon left off with Chou En-lai». Podgorny will build up a mountain of slanders to the Vietnamese about these coming Sino-American talks. To what extent the Vietnamese will be taken in by this, is another matter, just as

Kissinger's third visit to Peking, of course, is another important matter.

The cordial Sino-American talks are continuing in Peking in a total black-out. Nothing is allowed to leak out either to their friends or to anyone else. Secret diplomacy is in force between «communists» and imperialists. «The world, and even our friends, must not know what we are talking about and what we are deciding, because this will spoil things for us.» This means: «We are collaborating closely in secrecy, and outside we launch a few multicoloured fireworks, possibly of the most brilliant red colours, to amuse the gallery».

FRIDAY
JUNE 16, 1972

WHY ALL THESE REPEATED THANKS?

Comrade Nesti Nase informed me that the Chinese Embassy, officially, in the name of the Foreign Ministry of China, brought us (for the umpteenth time) ardent thanks for the great aid we have given China over its admission to the UNO and other international organizations, for the great experience which we have, for our help and the close collaboration which we must have, etc., etc.

The question arises: Why these repeated thanks and praises? We must see what is behind all this!

WEDNESDAY
JUNE 21, 1972

A «LOVELY» SINO-AMERICAN AGREEMENT

The German-American Henry Kissinger, the chief adviser of the fascist Nixon, has been in Peking for three days. His going to China was the subject of a brief announcement in Peking and Washington. This announcement said that «problems of interest to the two countries will be discussed». A fine formula, which means in other words, «There is no reason for others to interest themselves in and worry over what we shall talk about; the things we are discussing are entirely internal matters, and others should not concern themselves about our internal affairs». **A «lovely» Sino-American agreement! And the talks are continuing in the greatest secrecy between «the angel» Kissinger and Chou En-lai, and who knows, perhaps, Mao, too, since it is all so secret.**

Why should protocol be observed between «friends»? Many kinds of protocol can be observed: with the Albanians, who, the Chinese say, are their «fast friends», they apply the protocol of completely ignoring them. We were told nothing about the fact that Kissinger was to go to Peking, let alone what would be discussed. We learned of this visit from the press. **Secret diplomacy is in operation from the Soviet side, from the Chinese, and from the Americans. Complete solidarity on this question from the three of them. Why should they involve others, they**

need to work in peace, the poor things! Or are they not working for the good of the world and the peoples!!

They are not leaking anything even to the Western journalists who are nearly sick with curiosity. Their mouths have been sealed. No doubt they are doing this, too, «in the interests of heavenly peace throughout the world».

How dreadful for China that it is getting caught up in these dirty traps! **In the diplomacy between the Soviet Union and China, capitalist America has become cock of the walk.** It is dictating to them the policy and the course! How terrible, how terrible! How long will the peoples tolerate these underhand dealings at their expense?!

SUNDAY
JUNE 25, 1972

PODGORNY IN HANOI, AND KISSINGER IN PEKING

Last evening we put on a dinner in honour of Sihanouk. He spoke very well both about Albania and his stands in politics and the war against the American aggressors. During the meal, we continued the political t,alks with him about the current international problems, about China, Vietnam and Laos. We also talked about culture and art in Cambodia and Albania. Sihanouk liked the Albanian songs and dances which our artists performed during this dinner.

A journey synchronized by the American diplomacy. The question of Vietnam is the key problem to be solved, of course, in favour of the United States of America and to the detriment of Vietnam.

The two mendicant monks, who set out, one from Moscow and the other from Washington, have harmonized their roles: the Soviets uphold the thesis that «China is encouraging the Vietnamese in the war», the Americans sing the other refrain: «the Soviet Union is encouraging the Vietnamese in the war». These two theses add up to the same thing and have as their aim to show that the Vietnamese are fighting for nothing. Hence, according to these gangsters, the Vietnamese are being killed and burned in vain, have gained nothing and have nothing to gain, and that the only course open to

them is «to reach agreement with the Americans on American terms».

Podgorny slipped away from Moscow for Hanoi furtively, like a thief in the night, to promote this lie and to exert pressure and blackmail on the Vietnamese. Nothing appeared in the Soviet press about the departure of the President of the Supreme Soviet of the Soviet Union, while Hanoi received him, and at the same time ignored him completely.

Before Nixon went to Moscow, the Soviet revisionist liars had promised the Vietnamese that they would send them modern long-range missiles. However, when Nixon arrived, of course after they reached agreement with him, the dispatch, not only of missiles but also of other war materials which they had promised, was withheld. The excuse found for this was: the sealing of Vietnamese ports by American mines. **«How could the Soviets have tried to break the blockade? This would have meant being attacked by the Americans, and this would have kindled the flames of a nuclear war!», «Tavarishi, are you in your right minds?! Do you want us to burn the quilt for one flea? But what about the world revolution, socialism, the communism which we are building in the Soviet Union?!!».** All these things, of course, must be understood correctly. The revisionists judge matters like this: **«We do not sacrifice our friendship with American imperialism, we have reached agreement to live in peace and friendship with it, we have divided our spheres of influence, which we defend with our bombs**, and we have them in colossal number, and can easily drop them on any third party which might rise in revolt and not obey us. Today the Vietnamese are being hit by American bombs, and that's all right, we say nothing. Tomorrow, someone else will be hit by our Soviet bombs,

and the United States of America will keep quiet. Between friends this stand is something natural».

Thus, after Nixon's visit to the Kremlin, the missiles were removed from the list, and after Podgorny's return from Hanoi, the missiles were turned into five guns and five trucks to pull them! But when are they going to arrive!

The Vietnamese did not accept Podgorny's proposals, because they were American proposals accompanied with Soviet blackmail and threats. They stood firm on their 7 points. Either war to the end, to victory, or acceptance by the Americans of the Vietnamese 7 points. This was a heavy slap in the face for Podgorny, who left Hanoi «with his tail between his legs». As long as the Soviet mendicant monk, the «special envoy of the Americans to Hanoi», was engaged in talks with the Vietnamese, Nixon stopped bombing Hanoi, while as soon as his friend departed, he recommenced the bombing even more barbarously.

Meanwhile, Kissinger sang the same song in Peking, but «set to an appropriate Chinese tune». We can guess this «tune», but to keep up appearances, the Chinese allegedly gave us, through our ambassador in Peking, «a general outline» to bring us up to date, from a certain Yu Chang, Deputy-Foreign Minister, who said: «I do not know the details about the talks which were held with Kissinger». Of course, this is not true, but even if it is so, go and get complete information and then come and tell us, if you have decided to inform us.

But what did Yu Chang say? He said that through Kissinger, Nixon assured the Chinese that nothing was decided in Moscow against China, that Nixon rejected all the hostile insinuations of the Soviets against the Chinese. In other words, it turns out that **the American allegedly defended China against the Soviets! Hence, the Soviets are bad, while the Americans allegedly are friends of**

China! See what times have come! Therefore, according to Yu Chang, Kissinger demanded that as many Americans as possible should come to China and develop trade. The Chinese replied: «We shall allow Americans to come to China, but we shall choose for ourselves those whom we (the Chinese) want!»

About Vietnam, Yu Chang said that in the past Kissinger allegedly told them that the Americans wanted to end the war as quickly as possible, but the Vietnamese were «stubborn». And the Chinese informed Kissinger of their «well-known» thesis that the question of Vietnam must be solved at the Paris Conference.

This was all Yu Chang said! Rubbish!!

DURRËS, SATURDAY
JULY 22, 1972

THE «LIN PIAO PLOT»

At last, after nearly eleven months, the Chinese comrades, through our ambassador in Peking as well as the Chinese ambassador in Tirana, have given us some official information about the «ultra-leftists» or the «Lin Piao plot».

The Chinese comrades tell us approximately this:

Now we (the Chinese) say that the ultra-leftists have been completely unmasked and the main one, the root of them, was Lin Piao. He raised the banner of Chairman Mao against Chairman Mao. During the Cultural Revolution he created a line left in form but right in essence, wanted to overthrow the dictatorship of the proletariat and restore capitalism in China. Liu, also, had the same aim, but he. as it seems, had the party in his grip and was restoring capitalism (the Chinese comrades describe this manner of action as rightist!), while Lin Piao wanted to take power and establish capitalism through the Cultural Revolution (the Chinese comrades describe this manner of action as ultra-leftist).

Lin Piao, said the Chinese comrades, was a typical two-faced element. Earlier, in the time of Wang Ming, Lin supported him, but at that time he was young. This was considered a mistake due to immaturity. Later he united with Mao, took part in the Long March, indeed did some good things, but also made mistakes during his work, which he corrected. Lin Piao was against the Korean

War and the sending of the Chinese volunteers there. He appeared to have admitted his mistakes, but on the other hand, he had undermined everything which was in the interest of the party. When Chairman Mao launched the Cultural Revolution, he took up the banner of Chairman Mao, but in fact he was working for himself.

They also told us: Chairman Mao was not in agreement with the assessments and glorification Lin made of Mao's ideas and work. All that glorification, which built up Mao to the skies, was anti-Marxist, because it put him above Marxism-Leninism, because the Chinese soldiers and officers hung portraits of Mao round their necks, because they bowed before the portrait of Mao every morning and made self-criticism before this same portrait (as before icons of Christ).

We Albanians condemned all these things as anti-Marxist and idealist craziness when we heard of them, while the Chinese leadership tolerated them to the extent that it even wanted to impose them abroad. We not only never accepted these actions, but condemned them with disgust from the time they first appeared in the Cultural Revolution.

The assessment that «Mao Tsetung thought is the highest peak of Marxism-Leninism» or that «Mao is the greatest Marxist-Leninist of our days», etc., which Lin Piao made (and the others swallowed) was idealist. The Chinese said that Mao had allegedly criticized Lin Piao for this long ago, and he had allegedy accepted the criticism, but in fact had continued his work in order to present himself as Mao's loyalest supporter.

In fact, he conspired to kill Mao on three occasions, say the Chinese, but they told us only of one occasion, the one in which Lin Piao's son, Deputy-Commander of the Air Force, had formed a group of a hundred people, with which he was to kill Mao and Chou En-lai, to

capture the premises of the Central Committee, and overthrow the state of the dictatorship of the proletariat.

Lin Piao is accused of inciting enemy elements to carry out sabotage against the party and to spark off clashes within the army during the Cultural Revolution. He h,ad created a group of loyal followers around himself, whose members tried to build him up through flattery.

The Chinese comrades said that Mao saw through Lin's words right at the start, but did not see his schemes. These conspiratorial activities came to light gradually, especially after the 9th Congress of the Communist Party of China. As is known, the decision that Lin Piao was to be the successor to Chairman Mao was approved at this congress. (This thing, too, just as all the other things, we Albanians condemned long ago.) Lin Piao, seeing that Mao Tsetung was in good health, was afraid that the torch would never be handed on to him and that was why he hatched up «the plot in order to seize power as rapidly as possible».

Lin Piao, the Chinese told us, felt that Mao would understand these things, therefore at the 2nd Plenum of the CC in 1970, he assembled his group to carry out a coup d'état. At that time, the Soviets committed the provocation on the Ussuri and brought 300,000 soldiers into Mongolia, on the border with China. That is, these were co-ordinated actions. Chen Po-ta was also part of this group, but Mao uncovered him and held up the plot. Chen Po-ta was unmasked (the Chinese comrades themselves have told us this). No measures were taken against Lin Piao. They say that Mao worked to save Lin. However, from the facts it turns out that he was not detected, but was criticized for a number of mistakes, while continuing to gather his men to stage an armed uprising.

When the plot was discovered, on the morning of

the 13th of September 1971, he fled by aircraft in the direction of the Soviet Union, but the plane crashed and burned in Mongolia. Five hours before the plane took off, Lin Piao's daughter informed Chou En-lai that her father was fleeing. Mao allegedly said: «Let him flee». In order to cover his own tracks, the conspirator Huang Yung-sheng proposed that they should shoot down the aircraft with rockets, but Mao stopped this, because they would be accused of murdering him, and they had no facts with which to accuse him. Aboard the aircraft were Lin Piao, his wife and his son, the pilot, with no navigator or radio operator, and some other persons of no importance, eight or nine people all told.

Hence, according to the Chinese comrades, immediately after the plot was discovered, Lin Piao wanted to go to the Soviet Union, and thus unmasked himself. The aircraft crashed and burned on the ground, because it ran out of fuel. «It was proved that the ultra-left trend had been hatched up and encouraged by Lin Piao and that the slogans to overthrow Chou En-lai, Chen Yi, and Yeh Chien-yi had been issued by him.»

«This means,» said the Chinese comrades, «that with the exposure of Liu Shao-chi, Lin Piao and other conspirators by the Cultural Revolution, the party has been purged, has emerged stronger, and with a higher level of consciousness in the struggle between the two lines and in the class struggle.»

Huang Yung-sheng, Li Huo-feng, Wu Fan-hsien, Tsin Hui-teh, who have been arrested, took part in Lin Piao's group of trusted followers. The Chinese told us: «We have said nothing publicly on this matter; as to other matters, we are waiting to see what the Soviets will say». It stands to reason that the Soviets will say nothing, because they do not want to compromise themselves, and neither do they want to compromise Lin Piao. The Chinese can wait

if they like). «Meanwhile, everybody in our country knows about this and is clear on it,» said the Chinese comrades. «We have not said anything outside. Dangerous situations in the struggle between the two lines have occurred on ten occasions in our Party, but this was the most dangerous and most serious. Now the ultra-left trend has been thoroughly exposed. The Cultural Revolution was protracted, because of the sabotage of Lin Piao,» they continue and then add: «Nr. 516 Organization was described as counterrevolutionary because on the 16th of May 1966 the Central Committee issued a document drafted by Mao about the Cultural Revolution, which was a call for the overthrow of Liu Shao-chi. Besides aiming the arrows at the overthrow of Liu, Lin Piao also aimed them against the Central Committee in order to overthrow it and then take power.» The Chinese comrades said that during the Cultural Revolution there were things which even they themselves did not understand. The teachings of Mao were not applied, because Nr. 516 Organization was counterrevolutionary. The document of 16th of May 1966 was discussed within the party, while on the 16th of May 1967 it was published for the masses to study it thoroughly (after a year?!).

The Chinese comrades said that Lin Piao was exposed little by little, that he worked behind the scenes. «We have had a great deal of sabotage in our external relations, and in the Foreign Ministry there were groups which were guided by the ideas of Nr. 516 Organization. Both we and Mao Tsetung,» said the Chinese comrades, «had understood Lin Piao's aims, but we did not think that he would engage in an open plot. Lin did not say much, but worked in secret.»

«The Report to the 9th Congress was only read by Lin Piao». (Astonishing! The Vice-Chairman of the party was allegedly a grammaphone record!)

This was the whole history of the Lin Piao plot, which the Chinese comrades reluctantly told us of, nearly a year later. What secret, mysterious thing was there that our Party, which they consider very close, should not be told at least the main facts of the event, and be told the other things later, after they had analysed them? Let it be, this passed like the rest. We have no reason not to believe this version which the Chinese comrades give us. We consider that such a thing is very likely to occur, indeed, even more dangerous plots can be hatched up, which may end up in catastrophe for the dictatorship of the proletariat and socialism. **This can occur if revolutionary vigilance is lost, if the party is not on the rails of Marxism-Leninism, if it is educated in the idealist spirit of the cult of the individual, and not on the basis of materialist dialectics and historical materialism.**

The «Lin Piao plot» was truly dangerous and rather frightening, because, as it turns out from what the Chinese comrades tell us, «Lin was closely linked with the Soviets». Hence, Lin, «together with his wife and his collaborators, was their agent».

But again the question arises: How was Lin Piao allowed to do all these things?! How was this man, who had made mistakes, placed at the head of the party and boosted so much?! How was it allowed that Chen Po-ta, the person they told us what he was, should be placed at the head of the Cultural Revolution?! How did it come about that «all those great mistakes», which were made during the Cultural Revolution, were not prevented in time?! They say that they did not understand! But these things were sticking out a mile, even we understood them from away over here, though we did not know many things and had no knowledge of the directives issued, so they should have understood them.

The fact is that the Communist Party of China was

not «on its feet», if it was not liquidated, it was paralysed, and the Chinese comrades say that Mao's directives were not implemented. Who was to implement them? The conspirators? It is self-evident that they would not implement them, but on the contrary, would sabotage them. If the Chinese comrades do not take these analyses through to the end, in order to disclose the true causes and find the true Marxist-Leninist cure, **nothing will go right in China, and other, even more serious things will occur there.** They say that such events have occurred ten times. This means that they have become a tradition, a line there. They can occur, it is a big country, a big party! However, the Chinese comrades have not drawn the real lessons from all these bad things. Groups in the leadership are quarrelling, attacking, being overthrown, one after the other. **As soon as one is overthrown, a second one rises, this falls and another rises. Explanations are made in the party, Mao alone remains the banner. All of them fight under the banner of Mao, but this banner of his is not identified with that of the party, so that this can wave. Idealism may be combated in words, but the cult of Mao is nothing other than idealism. Instead of strengthening the party, making it self-acting, a leading force, it paralyses it, makes it an automaton. Decisions are made only when Mao is asked to say the word, but how he will say this word, depends on those who dictate it to him.**

Apparently, as far as it is possible for us to judge from the facts available, Mao and the Chinese comrades thought that the Great Proletarian Cultural Revolution should have been over within the year, without strife or struggle. The Liu Shao-chi clique, which had a firm grip on the reins (and Mao himself told our comrades: «We do not know who will win»), would surrender immediately, without resistance. An astounding concept of the revolution and the class struggle!!

The enemy seizes power from you and is establishing capitalism, and you think you are going to wipe out the enemy while excluding any violent method. **Then, when these things, which are entirely possible, occur, you call them «ultra-left», irrespective of who Lin Piao was. But the revolution was guided by Mao and on the staff of the revolution there were also Chou En-lai, Kang Sheng, Chiang Ching, etc. What did they do?** Were they in agreement with these things that were done, or not? If not, why did they not prevent them? If they were unable to stop them, because Lin was all-powerful, then they cannot say: «We did not understand at all what Lin Piao was up to». To understand what Lin Piao was up to at the last minute, when his daughter comes and tells you that her father is about to flee, shows great ideological and political blindness.

Then to fail to prevent Lin Piao from fleeing, means to have astounding ideas about the class enemy and the class struggle. This speaks of the megalomaniac idea of the great state which says: «Let this enemy get away, even if he is Lin Piao; he will expose himself». This is true, but it is not right to think that he can do no harm.

The Chinese comrades present Lin Piao as very «cunning», but he did not show himself at all cunning in his plot and his treachery. His plans to kill Mao and Chou En-lai do not seem to be all that refined; on the contrary they are clumsy: a coup d'état with a hundred men, as in Latin America.

According to what the Chinese say, Lin Piao emerges as a simple agent of the Soviets whom they have put in a tight corner and told: Act at all costs, kill Mao, seize power, because «China has joined the United States of America». However, the Ussuri incident occurred before Nixon's visit to Peking, about which the Chinese comrades told us not a word. **Was Lin Piao in agreement over the**

talks with Kissinger and the decisions which were taken? On this, they are silent, saying not a word. Why?! Can it be because we were against Nixon's going to Peking, that they are not telling us? Yes, we were and are against Nixon's going to Peking, for totally different reasons. We base our stand on correct aims and principles. If they are not telling us anything in connection with this problem in order to avoid offending us, thinking that allegedly on this point we were in agreement with the Soviets and Lin Piao, so much the worse for them! In this case they, the Soviets and Lin Piao, are in ultra-right, revisionist positions, in accord with American imperialism and in strife with one another to win a powerful imperialist partner. **Hence, this very important point remained unexplained to us by the Chinese comrades. But this does not surprise us, because this is neither the first nor the last unexplained point.**

The policy of opening doors to the United States of America in these forms and ways in which it was done by the Chinese, marked a great about-face. It is not possible that Lin Piao did not have and express his own opinion on this policy. He has expressed his opinion. **At least as far as we know officially, Lin Piao was against both the Soviets and the Americans to the end. Kang Sheng was in these positions, too. Was he a conspirator as well? Or was he ultra-left and blind and did not see what was going on around him? In the explanations which the Chinese have given us all this remains obscure.**

The other question, again somewhat obscure to us, is the attempt by Lin Piao to flee by aircraft. It seems a very careless flight, completely unorganized. How was it possible that Lin Piao, the Minister of Defence of China, Vice-Chairman of the party, on whom «they have no facts», did not know that his daughter had denounced him five hours before he was to flee?! How is it possible that «the secret

agent of the Soviets», as he has been described, who entrusted the arrangements for his flight to his son, a conspirator, the Deputy-Commander of the whole Chinese Air Force, should select an aircraft without a crew, without sufficient fuel, without a radio, which would crash in Mongolia and be burned up like a child's toy?! **Such actions do not seem in the least like those of the putchist plotters who, as they told us, were going to kill Mao and Chou En-lai and take everything in hand with a hundred men. It seems surprising that Lin Piao took off so precipitately, while his main collaborators and** *pezzi grossi* **stayed behind and did not move at all. Astonishing!! However such amazing things occur in China, therefore they should not surprise us this time, either. We have believed them a thousand times before, so why not now!**

However there are surprising things which amaze one and make one think. What is not being said about Lin Piao now, even by the Chinese themselves. Apparently, everybody in China has been informed about this event. Even our various specialists who go to China are told about it by the organizations which meet them. The background is the same but the *fioriture** differ. What are they not saying now about the past of Lin Piao!! Then the question arises even more forcefully: How was it possible that this person reached the posts which he occupied? **Moreover, it is said that Mao knew of Lin's mistakes, had criticized him and wanted to correct him!! Then to correct this person, was it necessary to make him Vice-Chairman of the Party and Minister of Defence?!! This is too much to swallow!**

The Chinese are saying now, «he cleared out in such haste that he forgot to take his cap, and at the aircraft he couldn't wait for the steps to be brought up, but scram-

* Embellishments (Italian in the original).

bled in with help from inside»!! Of course, the fact that Lin Piao left with such haste, «from fear that he would be captured», has been brought up as an argument to justify the version that the aircraft had insufficient fuel. The haste was also the reason that the aircraft did not have a radio-operator or a navigator!! These things are hard to swallow! «Lin Piao fled,» they say, «because he realized the plot had been discovered from the time Chen Po-ta was exposed.» However, his «get-away» occurred months and months after the exposure of Chen Po-ta and Lin Piao had the possibility «to get away» not once but twenty times.

On the other hand, how is it possible that the Vice-Chairman of the Party and Minister of Defence of such a great country as China, «such a dangerous conspirator», should so lose his head as to forget his cap, that the steps to board the aircraft were missing and the plane had insufficient fuel for the flight? Then, how did this «dangerous conspirator» get away and leave his associates, the other conspirators, in the lurch? Did they not have the possibility to seize aircraft from other points and make their escape? Of course they had. Why did they not do this, but only Lin Piao?

What about the other version: Could they have forced Lin Piao to flee and liquidated him on the way? Kamikaze!

Let us suppose the version according to which Lin Piao had expressed opposition to the line which was being followed, we do not know in what directions, but we must assume on the policy which began to be followed towards the United States of America. His opponents taxed him with being pro-Soviet and dangerous. Then it was decided to liquidate him. They had no facts about a conspiracy, but they fabricated facts and in this way a plot was hatched up against him. He was summoned urgently to Peking, boarded an aircraft and, when he saw that he was not landing in Peking, asked: Where are we

going? When later they saw they were in Mongolia, he and his people brought out their revolvers and killed themselves. What went on inside? The aircraft came down and was burned out. Nothing was learned.

A Canadian newspaper reported that «Kissinger had told the Canadian Prime Minister that expertise had proved that bullet marks were found in the wreckage of the aircraft». How true is this? Are the Soviets telling the truth or telling lies? It could be true, it could be a lie. The Soviets have the key to this mystery! But it is advantageous to them to give such a version, which makes what we supposed above more plausible. Why? - comes the question. Why was there shooting within the aircraft?! Who opened fire and why?! Did only Lin Piao fire?! And if we accept this version, he started shooting because he saw that they were taking him outside China, to Mongolia (and not to the Soviet Union, as the Chinese say), against his will.

All these versions are suppositions dictated by the unclarity of the facts which the Chinese themselves provide. Officially we accept all that the Chinese say, but time will explain everything.

DURRËS, SUNDAY
JULY 30, 1972

TWO FACTS ABOUT LIN PIAO

All the ambassadors of China, wherever they are, are making contact with our ambassadors and informing them about the betrayal of Lin Piao. It is the same version that was given us officially. There is only a single nuance, on the part of the chargé d'affaires of the Chinese Embassy in Chile, who told our ambassador there, «The friends of Mao killed Lin Piao and the aircraft was shot down in Mongolia». This is the first time we have been told this by the Chinese side and it is in conformity with a news item of a Canadian newspaper, which writes that when Kissinger was in Canada this year, he allegedly told the Canadian Prime Minister that in the burned out Chinese aircraft, which had crashed in Mongolia, signs of bullets fired within the aircraft had been found. This means, according to them, that there must have been an armed clash in the aircraft.

Is the chargé d'affaires at the Chinese Embassy in Chile basing himself on this and drawing the conclusion, or does he have this information from his centre? This we do not know. The other Chinese ambassadors are not speaking about such a thing.

FRIDAY
SEPTEMBER 1, 1972

THE VISIT OF A DEPUTY-FOREIGN MINISTER OF CHINA TO TIRANA

The Deputy-Foreign Minister Chiao Kuang-hua came to Albania on a working visit, at the invitation of our Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to discuss together, as the allies we are, the problems of this year's session in the UNO. He passed through Rumania on his way here. There he had talks with Manescu. **In his talks with our comrades he said, «he was not satisfied with those talks», and abused Manescu as a rogue, saying that «Rumania follows a policy like that of a capitalist state», that they left his comrades without a meal, and that he would tell Chou En-lai that «the aircraft which flies on the route from Peking should fly direct from Athens to Tirana, without going through Bucharest», etc.**

Chiao Kuang-hua stayed no more than two days in Tirana, and asked that nothing should be written in the press. Why? He gave no reason. But in fact, according to what our comrades say, he took great pleasure in boasting. However, this is of no importance, a small matter. He had talks with Comrade Nesti, Reiz and Çeno, and then was received by Comrade Mehmet, too.

Chiao Kuang-hua came to our country on the pretext of our invitation to discuss the problems of the UNO and to exchange opinions about «the international horizon». In fact, however, the true purpose of his visit was to

«bring us up to date» in an ambiguous way about the question of Lin Piao and «about the correct tactics» of the current Chinese policy in the international field. Both to the comrades of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and especially to Comrade Mehmet, Chiao Kuang-hua presented himself as «specially instructed by Chou En-lai to talk openly and in a comradely way with the comrades of the Albanian leadership about the problems which are worrying us». Apparently, he thought that I would receive him, too, a thing which was not realized, because I was in Korça, and he was to stay no more than two days.

During the talks he had with Mehmet (in Korça I read the minutes which had been taken), **Chiao Kuang-hua said two or three words about Lin Piao who «was a rogue, a plotter who tried to flee by aircraft to the Soviet Union, but the aircraft crashed and burned in the vicinity of Ulan Bator. At one time Lin Piao wanted to escape to Hong Kong, but later he took the road to Mongolia».** This is what he said about Lin Piao, no more and no less! As if to mock us! And this they no doubt call «officially informing the Party of Labour of Albania»!

As it seems from his conversation, his other aim was to convince us that the tactics used by China, whether on the question of talks with the Americans, or in their other stands towards the revisionists and reaction, are correct, principled, Leninist. Hence, they are not violating principles, are exploiting the contradictions among the enemies, and this is precisely the aim of the compromises which might be reached eventually.

All these things the Chinese comrade tried to put in opposition to our line, implying that on these issues (if there were any), there might be two different views between us, while on everything else we were in agreement. In other words, he wanted to say, «You (the Albanians) are against compromises on tactical questions, which Lenin

and Stalin advise, because you do not understand and do not act to deepen the contradictions which exist between the enemies. Hence, you are sectarian and leftist, if not ultra-leftist»!

Naturally, these insinuations of Chiao Kuang-hua have no foundation, are provocative. Without making any mention of our letter sent to their Central Committee on the occasion of Nixon's going to Peking, the Chinese comrade meant that, with what he said, he was officially replying to this letter and, naturally, he rejected it...

Our theses prove that, as always, we are neither sectarian, rightist, nor leftist, but are principled, fight on the two flanks, against imperialism and revisionism, fight for the deepening of contradictions and make compromises with those states and at those times and in those circumstances which we judge favourable to us, but never over matters of principle and ideology.

We were not opposed to the idea that China should talk with the United States of America, but these talks should have been held under equal conditions: first, the People's Republic of China should have been recognized as the only lawful state, diplomatic relations should have been established, and the problem of Taiwan should have been resolved.

Second, the circumstances were not appropriate to receiving Nixon, because he and the United States of America are aggressors in Vietnam and elsewhere, and this visit would strengthen Nixon's position before the elections. Nixon, on his part, had no intention of making any concession to China, and in fact did not make any.

The rapprochement with the United States of America confused world public opinion about China, placed China in a position almost identical to that of the Soviet Union over the peaceful settlement of world problems and the revolution, and at the same time, enraged the Soviet Union

against China as a rival which is making approaches to the United States.

The Chinese defend the thesis that the Soviet Union will attack them, because it has massed a million soldiers on the border with China. Anything could occur, but **we defend the thesis that, at present the Soviet Union is afraid of world war, and will not do this.** It is exerting pressure on China over many questions, and for the reason that China is demanding adjustments of the borders. The example which the Chinese bring up, that the Soviet Union attacked Czechoslovakia, does not serve to prove an attack on China at the present time. The case of the attack on Czechoslovakia, where not one shot was fired against the social-imperialist invasion, is a different matter from an attack against China, in which the Soviet Union bears in mind the fact that it would have to face a war on a world scale.

It is clear that the Soviet modern revisionists are enemies, and that it is essential that preparations be made for any eventuality, **but to use such an unreal, circumstancial eventuality to make approaches to and rely on another savage aggressor, is wrong.**

The example of the non-aggression pact which the Soviet Union signed with Hitlerite Germany, which this revisionist, the Chinese Deputy-Foreign Minister, brought up as a weighty argument for us, whom they call Stalinists, who allegedly do not make and do not know how to make compromises, must be totally rejected. The Soviet Union's pact with Hitlerite Germany at that time and in those circumstances was correct. But today, the circumstances and the time for China, the Soviet Union and the United States of America are not as they were then. **You, China, are establishing friendship with him who up till now has committed open armed aggressions and will commit other aggressions tomorrow; and you will establish friendly rela-**

tinos with the Soviet Union tomorrow; you will quickly become friends with these two superpowers, if you judge these situations as it pleases you to do and not on the basis of a Marxist-Leninist analysis, and if you make non-principled compromises, decking them out in false Leninist robes. These and other questions of this nature should have been touched on, of course, in a friendly and theoretical form, with the Chinese comrade. However, we told him some things, and we shall find the time to tell the Chinese the rest.

CHINA IS STRENGTHENING ITS POSITIONS IN THE INTERNATIONAL ARENA

Now, after the opening move of China to Japan (and this was realized with Tanaka's visit in conditions which were dignifying and correct for China, because Tanaka publicly expressed his regret about the evil things which Japan had done to China, recognized the Chinese Government and declared that Taiwan is part of China), it remains for China to improve its relations with India, too.

These two major political actions are such as to strengthen the position of China in the international arena, and truly deepen the contradictions of Japan with the United States of America, on the one hand, and with the Soviet Union, on the other, and all this is in favour of China. The same thing will occur with India if China acts. China's links with Pakistan should not be an obstacle to the solution of this problem. The time will come when the Khans of Pakistan, whether Aga Khan or Bhutto, will kiss and make up with the Indians. However, such actions on China's part ruin the plans of American imperialism and the Soviet revisionists in the Far East and throughout the world.

I have expressed these views of ours to the Chinese comrades a long time ago, just as we have also expressed our view on what conditions should have been set for the Sino-American meeting.

THURSDAY
SEPTEMBER 28, 1972

THE MEETING WITH THE JAPANESE WAS IN FAVOUR OF CHINA

We must let the Chinese comrades know that we consider the stands of the People's Republic of China in connection with opening up political relations with certain capitalist states correct. We think that the meeting with Nixon was not opportune, under those conditions in which it was held, while the meeting with the Japanese was opportune, in favour of China, and to the disadvantage of the United States of America and the Soviet Union.

SATURDAY
SEPTEMBER 30, 1972

THE CHINESE HAVE NOT YET DECIDED WHERE THEY WILL GET THE TECHNOLOGICAL EQUIPMENT FOR OUR METALLURGICAL COMBINE

Last evening I attended the dinner which the Chinese ambassador gave on the occasion of the 23rd anniversary of the proclamation of the People's Republic of China. Among other things, I expressed my views to the ambassador about the importance of the Sino-Japanese agreement and did not fail to tell him, also, what we think about the Sino-Indian relations. The Chinese ambassador, on his part, said that they will soon establish relations with the Federal German Republic and added that they will try to get the most modern equipment from Japan and the Federal German Republic, because «Chinese industry is very backward». He did not say how they will get it, with credits, with clearing, or buy it with hard currency, but he mentioned in passing that they will act in this way with the American capitalists, too.

Without raising the issues as a problem, because our economic delegation will do this when it goes to Peking, I spoke about our difficulties in securing supplies of many raw materials, about the high cost of transport, and the long time required for the transport of goods which come from China to Albania. With this I hinted to him that

China should secure many of these goods for us from the countries of Europe with which it has trade relations.

The ambassador said, also, that they will try to get the technological equipment for our metallurgical combine from Canada. In other words, they have not yet solved the key problem for this very important major project! This presents many dangers for us. We shall see what develops.

SUNDAY
OCTOBER 15, 1972

THE CHINESE GOVERNMENT DOES NOT SEE THE POSSIBILITY OF FULFILLING OUR ECONOMIC REQUIREMENTS

Our ambassador in Peking transmitted to us the text of the conversation which he had with a Chinese official who had communicated to him the opinion of his government about the following:

Our comrades had presented to Fan Yi, when he was in Tirana, certain requests connected with the problems of our perspective plan for 1975-1980, and concretely about increasing the capacity for smelting ferro-nickel, the construction of the Koman hydro-power station and the extension of the Ballsh thermal-power station. However, for the time being, the Chinese Government does not see it possible to fulfil these requests. They gave their «difficulties» as the reason, saying: «We do not have big reserves», «we shall see, let us first build the things we have undertaken», etc.

These excuses of theirs are unfounded. We shall return to this major problem again. China has the possibilities and they will be even greater in the future.

VLORA, SUNDAY
DECEMBER 17, 1972

READING THE MINUTES OF A TALK WITH CHOU EN-LAI

On reading the minutes taken by the comrades of our military delegation in their talk with Chou En-lai in Peking, we can draw some conclusions:

In his talk Chou En-lai dealt mainly and at greatest length with the problems of China's foreign policy, with some of its main aspects, with internal problems, and first of all, with the «Lin Piao plot». He spoke about the relations of China with our country at the end.

In connection with their relations with us, Chou En-lai spoke «in friendly terms», and concentrated mainly on the aid they are giving us. He emphasized that in regard to the provision of aid, we come after Vietnam, and then all the other countries, such as Korea, etc., in turn. This is a judgement that only they can make, but for our part, we say that they can give us more. Indeed, they themselves say, «We are not helping you as much as we should, because we are still in difficulties, and when these are overcome, we will help you more».

In general, in the minutes, and in the earlier talks of Chou En-lai with our delegations, the «concern» of the Chinese comrades about the provision of aid for us «successfully and on time», both in the civil sector and in the military sector, is brought out. However, they blame the delays in deliveries or fulfilments of orders on the sabotage

carried out by Lin Piao. This was, so to say, the main theme of Chou En-lai's talk, the essence of which I shall deal with below.

The picture which Chou En-lai presented about the problems of foreign policy was not something «brilliant», although spun out at considerable length. **At first, when I read the minutes, I had the impression that he was speaking to our comrades, but in fact he was also speaking to the gallery, to the Chinese comrades whom he had invited to the meeting. The problems which he raised were known to us, there was no originality about the content of what he said, and neither was the future perspective of the international policy of China apparent in all its breadth.** They were the usual stands in the UNO known to us, over a series of problems which others raise and on which China has to take a stand.

The object of this stand is: «We must oppose and unmask» the Soviet stands which «are deceiving and misleading others.» Fair enough, but no vigorous political action is being carried out by China to attract attention in the UNO, to really attract the «neutrals» from the Soviet influence and to make these «neutrals» feel the assurance of having a genuine strong supporter in China. Moreover, it is not apparent in Chou En-lai's speech that a plan of work and problems has been thought out to disturb the comfortable status quo created in the UNO for the enemies, so that one is not obliged to accept the law they lay down. I think that it is not enough just to say, as Chou En-lai does, «we shall fight even if we remain alone in the UNO, because we are fighting for justice». This is right, but since we are fighting for justice, many others ought to support us, and these many others will not support us if we do not support them, and not just by «providing them with credits», because the imperialists and the social-imperialists do this, too, but by mercilessly

exposing these two superpowers, a thing which China is not doing in the way it should and as much as it should, at present.

The small peoples want the superpowers to be exposed and hindered in their activity. If concessions are made to the superpowers, if you show nuances and preferences in relations with them, allegedly in order to balance or counter-balance them, then you lose the interest and trust of the peoples, because they see the governments of their countries performing such acrobat's tricks everyday to escape the grip of the big powers. They carefully observe the stands of China especially, because they consider it a powerful socialist state.

China is showing publicly that it has nuances in its foreign policy, at least in its propaganda against the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Chou En-lai himself said: «We hit hardest at the Soviets, because they are more deceptive, since they pose as socialists, while the American imperialists have been exposed for what they are». This may or may not be true, but to proclaim this and to discriminate between them in practice is not right, because in this way the two superpowers will fight you with the weapon you give them yourself. In this case, the Soviet revisionists say: «China is against socialism», «it is united with the American policy». And in fact, the very differentiation which China makes publicly today, in saying that the number one enemy is the Soviet Union and then comes the United States of America, puts it on the side of the latter. The others have reason to think like this, regardless of the fact that Chou En-lai does not fail to say that the Soviet Union and the United States of America are both the same.

In regard to the policy which China is pursuing towards the United States of America, Chou En-lai said almost nothing; **perhaps, knowing our views, he deliberately pas-**

sed over this question in silence, or did not want to reveal the «provisional approaches to relations», which may burst into flower after «peace is signed in Vietnam». I think that Chou En-lai did not speak on this point for both these reasons.

Chou En-lai's view in connection with the perspective of the war in Vietnam reinforces this opinion. He said that the Soviet Union is giving Vietnam little aid. This is true, but to give Vietnam little aid means to weaken its defence. **Chou En-lai was of the opinion that the Soviet Union wants the war in Vietnam to continue.** Here there is a contradiction in that «on the one hand, you do not help the Vietnamese, and on the other hand, you want the war to continue». The Soviets may want the war in Vietnam to continue, they may want the United States of America to remain tied up in this war, to hinder China from strengthening its «friendship with the United States of America», so that it continues not to have diplomatic relations with the USA, and the question of Taiwan and the «stationing» of the US 7th Fleet in Chinese waters to remain «unresolved».

The Soviets are making all these plans, which are in their interest, but such a thing is not really in conformity with what they are doing, with their failure to assist Vietnam with weapons. Of course, the Soviets, in alliance with the Americans, have many variants of plans in their satchels, which they keep up to date, link and co-ordinate with all the world problems into which they have poked their noses.

Chou En-lai scarcely mentioned the problems of Europe and the Middle East, and this was not because he does not have his own opinions about the major problems which are boiling up there. China is continuing a policy of little interest in these zones and, in my opinion, this is a mistake, because the solution of the political and military problems

in these countries has major consequences for the countries of Asia. It is precisely here, in Europe and the Near and Middle East, that the two superpowers are trying to find a common language, to consolidate their alliance and to have their hands free for other regions, at least, for a period. To pursue a passive policy, as China is doing, at these moments and over these regions, is not a far-sighted policy, because by acting in this way you are waiting for your «opponent and ally» to come to imaginary «agreements» which you arranged with him at one time. This means «to wait for the shadow», which is hypothetical with the imperialists, because they have worked precisely so that «you, China, should wait for the shadow», until they «attend to their problems», and when they have tidied them up, without any difficulty, because «you China are not hindering us on our road»; then they will come, «but with a knife between their teeth».

The other question which Chou En-lai raised during the talk was about the internal situation in China, the question of the Lin Piao group. He spun this problem out at length, although in general what he said was what their ambassador told us officially.

Chou En-lai described the activity of Lin Piao as among the most dangerous which China has experienced. «Lin Piao and his associates,» he said, «were among the most dangerous conspirators, but they were a small group of nine people.» **Here we see the first contradiction. Of course, Chou's version that they were conspirators is accepted, but it is astonishing that these nine or ten people constituted the greatest danger for China, just as the other contradiction that Lin Piao and his group sabotaged everything during the Cultural Revolution, is astonishing!** There is no doubt that, as the enemies they were, they damaged and impeded things, but to blame them for every instance of damage, every failure to fulfil plans, every small defect,

is making the dose rather strong. It is said that this small but very dangerous group sabotaged industry, agriculture, and its mechanization, sabotaged the weapons of the army, etc., etc.

We put the question: But the others, the good ones, where were they?

According to Chou En-lai, every mistake in the course of diplomacy, policy, ideology was made by the group of Lin Piao.

We put the question: But the good ones, where were they? Why did they not react?

Lin Piao built up the cult of Mao to a high level and it was he who called Mao «a great Marxist-Leninist», «the great leader», «the great helmsman».

Again we put the question: But the others, the good ones, where were they? Why did they not stop these things?

According to Chou En-lai, Lin Piao was the man of the Soviets, but again, **according to Chou En-lai, he was afraid of an imminent attack by them against China, to the point that, without the knowledge of the Bureau or Mao, he had given orders for the airfields to be filled with steel obstacles to prevent the Soviet aircraft from landing, and for the dykes to be breached and cities inundated to hinder the Soviet paratroops.**

Thus, in the minutes of Chou En-lai's exposition one finds a series of events connected and isolated, all to prove that the Lin Piao group was a dangerous group of traitors, saboteurs, etc. **Chou En-lai went so far as to say, «Lin Piao pretended to be sick but he was a malingerer».**

Many astonishing things about a person who «had achieved a very high position».

Why should we not accept all these things which they are dishing up to us now about Lin Piao, about a man

who was quite unknown to us? He never appeared on the scene, had no activity at all, and as to what he was or was not, we know nothing, except that Mao, Chou and the others and the whole party supported him. Yesterday all of them said the most marvellous things about him, while today they ascribe every evil to him.

We are quite unable to determine how far these enemies had gone in their activity, say the Chinese! But according to Chou, their activity had gone so far as the organization of plots (not just once) to kill Mao.

We have numerous queries to raise about this internal question of China, because, in this treatment of problems, as Chou En-lai gave it — and this is also the official version presented to their whole party, there are many major contradictions.

First, in this presentation of problems, the hostile work of Liu Shao-chi and his big group, which had taken everything in its hands, had eliminated Mao and had reduced the party to such a state that the Cultural Revolution had to be launched to clean up this situation, **is completely forgotten.** Mao himself has several times said to our comrades: «It is not yet known who will win, we or they».

As far as we know, the Chinese comrades have not made a thorough Marxist-Leninist analysis of the hostile activity of the Liu Shao-chi group to disclose the roots and sources of this activity. Articles have been written and propaganda made against it, but this has remained only propaganda. The facts show that during the Cultural Revolution, another more dangerous enemy group emerged in the leadership and it was at the head of the Cultural Revolution. This group, which was at the head, and which had as its task to purge the pro-Soviet enemies, Liu and his group, turns out to be pro-Soviet itself!

It was necessary to carry out the Cultural Revolution,

but were the directives which guided it clear? Yes and no. It seems as if the directives emerged from an amazing spontaneity, and this caused distortions to the right and the left. The Lin Piao group was «ultra-leftist».

A great deal has been said and written about the Cultural Revolution, but no profound analysis of it has been made by the Chinese comrades. Was the Cultural Revolution beneficial or harmful to China? The Chinese say that it Was beneficial, but how then is it explained that Lin Piao and his nine collaborators sabotaged everything?

Such analyses are not very serious. Lin Piao and company carried out sabotage, but what has become of all the hostile activity of Liu Shao-chi?! And all those others whom this group left behind in the party and the state, did they not continue their sabotage?! These things are underestimated. The great vacillations of the working class, indeed even the sabotage and the fights with the people of the Cultural Revolution, have been forgotten, it has been forgotten that the party ceased any activity and was so badly smashed that it still has not been organized. And what about the organizations of the masses, which were completely liquidated? Why? Because «they were not in order». Has this great disorder not caused damage, held things up, resulted in sabotage? These things must be analysed, but they are not analysed merely by saying that Lin Piao has done all these evil things.

It has been said and Chou En-lai continues to say: «The army was and is the backbone». Astonishing!! At the head of the army was Lin Piao, and «he could not use the army for his own purposes», while he was able to sabotage everything when Mao and Chou were at the head!! This is incomprehensible, or becomes comprehensible only by thinking that the Communist Party of China was not on the right road, did not think and act on the basis of

Marxism-Leninism, and on the basis of the Leninist norms of a truly revolutionary party.

In fact, various groups with different tendencies have run things in the leadership of the Communist Party of China. Mao was a philospher, but it seems he did not link his philosophy much with practice, was liberal, and in this direction allowed others to organize, to lead, and to distort. He placed little importance on the collective method of leadership, and allowed the groups to act as though there were nothing wrong with this. And the groups attacked one another. Mao was not an outsider and reacted to the attacks of these groups, but it were the groups that operated under the banner of Mao, and with this banner tried to eliminate Mao himself. Liu Shao-chi and company acted in this way, and so did Lin Piao and company.

But Chou En-lai, what did he do? In all circumstances, he had always shown himself very resilient, very pragmatic, a person who goes along with everybody, with the strongest, so long as they are in power, and against them when they are overthrown. Chou always linked any stand of his, whether for or against, with «Mao Tsetung thought». Hence, at any time, whether good or bad for him, at the beginning or end of any event, he waved the «banner of Mao».

This showed that Chou En-lai. following Mao Tsetung, thought like all the rest, acted on the line of Liu Shao-chi and applied it in policy, in ideology and especially in the economy. Likewise with the group of Lin Piao; it maintained these same stands.

When these two groups broke their necks, Chou En-lai's neck was still whole. He is more a diplomat than a Marxist and manoeuvres in any circumstances.

Chou En-lai was necessary to all, from Mao to Lin Piao, because he is a capable person, a great organizer, an outstanding economist, a talented diplomat, and at the

same time, a perfect opportunist. In all these directions he is one of the most outstanding figures of China after Mao, indeed, I may say, even more qualified than Mao Tsetung.

It is fair to say that he has placed these abilities, not of a resolute Marxist, in the service of China, as he conceives it, on a broad liberal platform. It is characteristic that this top leader of China displays great organizational ability in everything, but does not put this talent in the service of the party, too. No, the party suffers from lack of organization. Why? One can think of many hypotheses, but now in this short note I cannot go into hypotheses because we do not have sufficient facts and documents to this end. The Chinese comrades are miserly in supplying facts and documents.

However, we shall see how and to what extent the Communist Party of China and its leadership will draw lessons from these experiences, how valuable they will be and how they will be applied to strengthen the situation in the party and in the state and for the benefit of socialism in China and the world.

We hope that everything will be put in order and go well there. We may be mistaken in these analyses, but it is not Marxist-Leninist to fail to make them, to fail to think and draw lessons for ourselves. We have been and are obliged to make our analyses on what the Chinese comrades tell us, which we believe, but in a critical Marxist-Leninist spirit.

CONTENTS

Page

Foreword **3**

1962

1. — April 3, 1962. The revolutionary communists expect China to come out openly against Khrushchevite revisionism **7**

2. — April 5, 1962. Time is working for us, but time goes very slowly for the Chinese **8**

3. — April 6, 1962. The Chinese are giving Khrushchev a hand **9**

4. — April 10, 1962. Why all these waverings towards the Soviet revisionists? **10**

5. — April 12, 1962. The Chinese comrades criticize the Soviet revisionists **12**

6. — April 13, 1962. A disguised Soviet attack against China over Albania **13**

7. — April 14, 1962. Woe betide those who fall into the revisionists' trap! **14**

8. — April 22, 1962. To cease the ideo-political struggle means to allow the enemy to harm you **17**

Page

9. — **June 13, 1962.** China is proceeding on a centrist course 19

10. — **June 24, 1962.** Time will tell whether we are right 21

11. — **July 2, 1962.** The Chinese are moving towards conciliation with the Khrushchevites 23

12. — **July 3, 1962.** We shall press on. We shall never surrender 24

13. — **July 4, 1962.** This smells of economic pressure. We must guard against provocations! 25

14. — **July 5, 1962.** The Chinese comrades are not drawing the proper conclusions from events in the world 26

15. — **July 10, 1962.** Pronounced tendencies to softening, fear, and passivity are appearing in the Chinese line 28

16. — **December 5, 1962.** Pajetta launched a harsh attack on the Communist Party of China 30

17. — **December 11, 1962.** The fight against traitors must be waged openly, sternly, and without compromise over principles 31

18. — **December 20, 1962.** China is not acting well in failing to reply to Khrushchev's attacks 33

19. — **December 23, 1962.** We have differences over tactics with the Chinese comrades, and this we have not hidden from them 35

20. — **December 24, 1962.** The stands of the Chinese comrades are improper in several di-

Page

rections 36

21. — **December 26, 1962.** Li Hsien-nien said the opposite of what he had said earlier about the contradictions between us 38

22. — **December 27, 1962.** Dead silence in Chinese foreign policy 39

1963

1. — **July 4, 1963.** Another stale communique 43

2. — **July 5, 1963.** A meeting which will not yield any result 44

3. — **July 11, 1963.** Today the Chinese are saying about Khrushchev what Khrushchev said yesterday about Tito 45

4. — **July 12, 1963.** The Chinese do not fully realize what an enemy Khrushchev is 46

5. — **July 13, 1963.** «The middle-of-the-roaders» lean mostly to the right 47

6. — **July 14, 1963.** The vain hopes of the Chinese comrades have gone with the wind 48

7. — **July 15, 1963.** Khrushchev has come out openly. The time has come for the Chinese to strike hard at this dog 49

8. — **July 17, 1963.** The Chinese are continuing their useless talks with Khrushchev 50

9. — **July 22, 1963.** The betrayers of Marxism-Leninism must be fought without mercy 51

Page

10. — **July 29, 1963.** Not capitulation, but struggle against revisionists 52

11. — **September 6, 1963.** The Chinese batteries open up against modern revisionism 55

1964

1. — **January 1, 1964.** Our guests were very satisfied 59

2. — **January 9, 1964.** Chou En-lai's visit is over... 60

3. — **March 6, 1964.** Fire to the end against Soviet revisionists! 65

4. — **April 17, 1964.** The lackeys decorate Khrushchev. The Chinese leadership sends him a telegram of congratulations 66

5. — **August 6, 1964.** There is something hidden here 67

6. — **August 18, 1964.** This means to turn whichever way the wind blows 68

7. — **August 21, 1964.** The Chinese are in national-chauvinist positions 71

8. — **August 22, 1964.** The struggle against Khrushchevism must not be diverted into territorial claims 74

9. — **September 4, 1964.** The Chinese are making gross and impermissible mistakes 78

10. — **September 15, 1964.** The Chinese stand: «They take the first step, we take the second» 84

Page

11. — October 6, 1964. Ominous signs..... **95**

12. — October 13, 1964. The Chinese have begun a campaign of approaches to the revisionists of Europe who are in power..... **110**

13. — October 15, 1964. The Chinese idea about an anti-imperialist front including even the modern revisionists is anti-Leninst..... **116**

14. — October 31, 1964. In no way can we reconcile ourselves to these views of Chou En-lai..... **125**

15. — November 3, 1964. The Chinese want to impose their opinions on us..... **136**

16. — November 4, 1964. Behind the tactic of «waiting» lies a marked doze of opportunism..... **144**

17. — November 5, 1964. The new course of the Chinese comrades is harmful to the communist movement..... **149**

18. — November 7, 1964. Brezhnev is trying to fool the Chinese first of all..... **154**

19. — November 8, 1964. A scandalous stand, everything they say is hypocritical, with dishonest aims..... **161**

20. — November 15, 1964. What results did Chou En-lai achieve in Moscow?..... **164**

21. — November 18, 1964. The Chinese press is silent about our articles and publishes the speeches of Soviet leaders..... **168**

22. — November 18, 1964. Chou En-lai's idea of setting up another UNO will not succeed. **171**

Page

23. — **November 21, 1964.** The defeat of Chou En-lai in Moscow 177

24. — **November 23, 1964.** Peking's reaction after Chou En-lai's return from Moscow 181

25. — **November 24, 1964.** A verbal communication of the Chinese ambassador in Tirana about Chou En-lai's talks in Moscow 186

26. — **December 1, 1964.** The Chinese comrades return to correct positions in their attitude towards the Soviets 187

1965

1. — **February 2, 1965.** A rigid policy of isolation of the Chinese Government 193

2. — **February 3, 1965.** Opportunist tactic of the Chinese comrades 200

3. — **February 13, 1965.** Mao Tsetung takes a firm and correct stand towards the revisionist Kosygin 203

4. — **February 27, 1965.** The Chinese are publishing Khrushchev's speeches 208

5. — **March 1, 1965.** The modern revisionists are making demagogy about the «anti-imperialist common front» 209

6. — **March 13, 1965.** Restraint exerted on China towards the activities of the Khrushchevites 215

7. — **December 27, 1965.** We shall support the Marxist-Leninist parties 218

Page

1966

1. — **August 9, 1966.** The cult of Mao Tsetung 223

2. — **August 20, 1966.** What is going on in China? 232

3. — **August 23, 1966.** Ideological deviations 243

4. — **August 26, 1966.** A sixteen-point document on the Cultural Revolution is approved 252

5. — **September 1, 1966.** The «Red Guard» 261

6. — **September 20, 1966.** The «red guards» are acting without leadership or control 267

7. — **September 23, 1966.** Our stand towards current events in China 270

8. — **September 24. 1966.** We must avoid being taken by surprise 274

9. — **September 26, 1966.** The army is recommended as a model for all, even for the party 277

10. — **October 6, 1966.** Very astonishing 282

11. — **October 10, 1966.** Theses on the unity of international Marxist-Leninist movement 287

12. — **October 17, 1966.** Again on the Cultural Revolution in China 293

13. — **October 23, 1966.** Nothing is solved correctly without the party 297

14. — **October 24, 1966.** How should the Chinese comrades have acted? 301

15. — **October 28, 1966.** It is up to **our** parties **to**

Page

concretize our links with the Marxist-Leninist movement 303

16. — **November 10, 1966.** Kang Sheng's explanations 308

17. — **November 14, 1966.** The events in China are being explained to us 311

18. — **December 9, 1966.** Conclusions on the basis of facts 315

19. — **December 30, 1966.** The continuation of the Cultural Revolution in China 318

1967

1. — **January 3, 1967.** Reading an article about the Proletarian Cultural Revolution in China 325

2. — **January 7, 1967.** The struggle against revisionists in China will be protracted 330

3. — **January 12, 1967.** We must support the correct objectives of the Cultural Revolution in China 336

4. — **January 15, 1967.** The party in China will strengthen itself by radically cleaning up the mistakes in its line 338

5. — **January 17, 1967.** Merciless struggle against enemies 342

6. — **January 29, 1967.** The revisionists in China aim to seize power quietly 344

7. — **March 3, 1967.** The distortions of principle in

Page

the organs of state power have resulted from the mistakes in line 347

8. — **April 7, 1967.** In China they are moving towards the «unification» of the party with the state 349

9. — **April 28, 1967**. Reflections on the Cultural Revolution. Anarchy cannot be combated with anarchy 352

10. — **May 3, 1967.** Can this be called a cadres policy? 361

11. — **May 22, 1967.** Notes on the Cultural Revolution in China. The party is not purged from outside, but from within 364

12. — **July 4, 1967.** Of what does the official press of the Communist Party of China accuse Liu Shao-chi? 367

13. — **July 14, 1967.** The foreign policy of China — a policy of self-isolation 369

14. — **July 24, 1967.** The Chinese diplomacy has fallen asleep 381

15. — **July 29, 1967.** China and international events 384

16. — **August 15, 1967**. It is good that they are dotting the i's 389

1968

1. — **January 16, 1968.** China is silent again. The period of isolation has recommenced 395

2. — **January 18, 1968.** This time the Chinese «came to light» 397

Page

3. — **January 19, 1968.** Good news from China: the party is being reorganized 398

4. — **January 20, 1968.** We shall not respond to the Chinese silence with silence 400

5. — **January 22, 1968.** Defeats and victories of the Chinese revisionists 401

6. — **March 20, 1968.** The voice of China is not being heard in the international arena 410

7. — **March 28, 1968.** The Chinese «are very busy with the revolution», therefore they are unable to meet the comrades of the Marxist-Leninist parties 414

8. — **April 25, 1968.** The Chinese comrades continue to shut themselves up in their own shell 415

9. — **June 2, 1968.** Advanced Chinese position on the war in Vietnam 417

10. — **October 15, 1968.** Chou En-lai's incorrect views on revisionism 419

11. — **October 24, 1968.** Chou En-lai's proposal of a Yugoslav-Albanian «defensive alliance» 427

1969

1. — **April 29, 1969.** The Chinese are silent about the events in Czechoslovakia and Europe 431

2. — **September 9, 1969.** They invite us to their celebration but there is nobody to receive us 433

3. — **September 12, 1969.** Another vacillating stand of the Chinese comrades 434

Page

4. — September 13, 1969. Kosygin in Peking 435

5. — September 15, 1969. Chou En-lai met Kosygin 436

6. — September 18, 1969. The echo of the Chou En-lai — Kosygin meeting 443

7. — September 19, 1969. The Chinese have been frightened by the Soviet blackmail 447

8. — September 21, 1969. The Chinese propaganda is not finding stability 451

9. — September 25, 1969. How is the Soviet blackmail towards China being pumped up? 452

10. — September 30, 1969. The Chinese are not talking about Soviet revisionism 457

11. — October 1, 1969. A talk with the Chinese ambassador 458

12. — October 8, 1969. For the Chinese the czars of the Kremlin have become «fine fellows»! 461

13. — October 14, 1969. Chen Po-ta was cordial with our delegation 462

14. — October 17, 1969. Something unbelievable 463

15. — October 18, 1969. The Chinese become advocates of Tito 464

16. — October 29, 1969. The old tactic in the polemic 465

17. — October 30, 1969. Meeting after meeting in Peking 466

18. — November 2, 1969. Mystery around the Sino-Soviet talks in Peking 467

Page

19. — **November 4, 1969.** The Chinese have even dropped the term «social-imperialism». 468

20. — **November 8, 1969.** At a dinner put on for our Embassy in Peking. 469

21. — **November 20, 1969.** A well-known theory 470

22. — **November 23, 1969.** Is Li Hsien-nien the only one who should come to Albania? 471

23. — **December 3, 1969.** Li Hsien-nien did not hold any political conversation with our comrades. 472

24. — **December 4, 1969.** Ideas which are not Li Hsien-nien's alone. 474

25. — **December 5, 1969.** Evil and provocative aims. 475

26. — **December 6, 1969.** Li Hsien-nien and his delegation. 477

27. — **December 6, 1969.** China should not involve itself with trifles in the international arena 484

1970

1. — **January 6, 1970.** No smoke without fire. 489

2. — **January 7, 1970.** Sino-American talks at ambassadorial level. 490

3. — **January 9, 1970.** An analysis which Mao ought to make. 491

4. — **January 26, 1970.** The opening up of Chinese foreign policy. 492

Page

5. — **June 22, 1970.** The Chinese talk about the «Rumanian plans in the Balkans» 495

6. — **July 7, 1970.** We do not lead our homeland into revisionist traps 498

7. — **July 24, 1970.** Today the Sino-Rumanian alliance, perhaps later the Chinese alliance with Tito 502

8. — **July 26, 1970.** Tito is playing his «pro-Chinese» card skilfully 506

9. — **July 31, 1970.** The Chinese are making love with the revisionists. Vigilance! 508

10. — **September 11, 1970.** Watch out, Chinese comrades, do not fall into the traps of enemies! 510

11. — **December 9, 1970.** A blameworthy attempt to hinder the construction of the Fierza hydro-power station 514

12. — **December 22, 1970.** What did Keng Biao say when he left Tirana? 516

1971

1. — **January 1, 1971.** The party is being reorganized in China 521

2. — **February 17, 1971.** Chen Po-ta is denounced as a traitor 523

3. — **April 15, 1971.** The «ping-pong policy» 528

4. — **May 23, 1971.** Ceausescu is to visit China 531

5. — **June 2, 1971.** The Chinese and Ceausescu 535

Page

6. — **June 7, 1971.** After Ceausescu the Chinese are expecting the Yugoslav Tepavac 539

7. — **June 8, 1971.** Chen Po-ta is accused of all the sins 542

8. — **June 12, 1971.** The Titoite foreign minister is welcomed to China 545

9. — **June 22, 1971.** The Chinese comrades «inform» us about the talks with Ceausescu 549

10. — **July 24, 1971.** The welcoming of Nixon to China is a major opportunist mistake 553

11. — **July 26, 1971.** Glaring revisionism 563

12. — **July 27, 1971.** An anti-Marxist line-up 569

13. — **July 28, 1971.** China, Vietnam, Korea and Nixon's visit to Peking 575

14. — **August 13, 1971.** The Soviet-Indian treaty and China 581

15. — **August 15, 1971.** The manoeuvres of the Chinese in the Balkans 586

16. — **September 24, 1971.** What the news agencies say about China 592

17. — **October 14, 1971.** The Communist Party of China is not sending a delegation to the 6th Congress of the Party of Labour of Albania 593

18. — **October 26, 1971.** The admission of China to the United Nations Organization 599

19. — **October 26, 1971.** Our congratulations on the admission of China to the United Nations Organization 603

Page

20. — October 28, 1971. Chou En-lai's talks with Henry Kissinger **604**

21. — November 9, 1971. The Chinese comrades and the 6th Congress of our Party **608**

22. — November 10, 1971. «Something» sensational **612**

23. — November 11, 1971. Chou En-lai leads the army, too **613**

24. — November 15, 1971. Notes about China **614**

25. — November 19, 1971. Carrillo in China **616**

26. — November 22, 1971. China, Vietnam and the secret negotiations with the United States of America **620**

27. — December 28, 1971. Mass American bombing of North Vietnam **624**

28. — December 30, 1971. The Indian-Pakistani war and China **628**

1972

1. — January 3, 1972. What is going on with the Lin Piao group? **641**

2. — February 2, 1972. The Americans are buttering up Chou En-lai **652**

3. — February 13, 1972. The Communist Party of China is in a revisionist position **653**

4. — February 20, 1972. The Chinese line against Soviet revisionism is fostered by national motives **658**

Page

5. — February 22, 1972. Mao Tsetung received Nixon **664**

6. — February 24, 1972. Mrs Nixon advertises China **665**

7. — February 25, 1972. The Chinese are fighting to capture hegemony in the revisionist camp from the Soviets **666**

8. — February 27, 1972. Mao and Chou please the Americans **670**

9. — March 3, 1972. The Chinese have deviated just like Khrushchev **671**

10. — March 4, 1972. The Chinese have not given us any official information about Nixon's visit **672**

11. — March 5, 1972. We draw conclusions on the basis of facts **675**

12. — March 14, 1972. The course of the silent boycott of Albania is being followed **678**

13. — March 18, 1972. No articles in the Chinese newspapers about Nixon's visit to China **681**

14. — March 21, 1972. Nixon's journey to China, the Sino-American talks, the final communique **684**

15. — March 22, 1972. China and the Soviet Union **695**

16. — April 17, 1972. A talk of Chou En-lai without political problems **698**

17. — April 20, 1972. China is getting deeper into an impasse **705**

18. — April 22, 1972. The Vietnamese offensive and China **706**

19. — May 22, 1972. Nixon in Moscow — China is silent **711**

Page

20. — May 29, 1972. The Soviet-American talks in Moscow and China's stand **715**

21. — June 9, 1972. The Chinese have ceased the polemics against American imperialism and Soviet revisionism **722**

22. — June 13, 1972. Secret diplomacy between «communists» and imperialists **723**

23. — June 16, 1972. Why all these repeated thanks? **726**

24. — June 21, 1972. A «lovely» Sino-American agreement **727**

25. — June 25, 1972. Podgorny in Hanoi, and Kissinger in Peking **729**

26. — July 22, 1972. The «Lin Piao plot» **733**

27. — July 30, 1972. Two facts about Lin Piao **745**

28. — September 1, 1972. The visit of a deputy-foreign minister of China to Tirana **746**

29. — September 27, 1972. China is strengthening its positions in the international arena **751**

30. — September 28, 1972. The meeting with the Japanese was in favour of China **752**

31. — September 30, 1972. The Chinese have not yet decided where they will get the technological equipment for our metallurgical combine **753**

32. — October 15, 1972. The Chinese Government does not see the possibility of fulfilling our economic requirements **755**

33. — December 17, 1972. Reading the minutes of a talk with Chou En-lai **756**